Broomfield

£1-80

/

L

EPISCOPACY
ANCIENT AND MODERN

EPISCOPACY
ANCIENT AND MODERN

EDITED BY
CLAUDE JENKINS, D.D.
K. D. MACKENZIE, M.A.

UNITED THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY

BV
670
.J4
1930

LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NEW YORK AND TORONTO: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

48,824 R.

First published 1930

Printed in Great Britain

CONTENTS

PAGE
PREFACE vii

I. THE ORIGINS OF EPISCOPACY . . . 1
W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D.

II. THE POSITION OF CLERGY AND LAITY IN THE EARLY CHURCH IN RELATION TO THE EPISCOPATE 47
A. J. Maclean, D.D., Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness.

III. THE MEDIAEVAL BISHOP 67
C. Jenkins, D.D., Canon of Canterbury.

IV. THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION:

(i) ENGLAND 87
C. F. Garbett, D.D., Bishop of Southwark.

(ii) WALES 114
L. J. Hopkin James, LL.D.

(iii) SCOTLAND 129
A. J. Maclean, D.D., Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness.

(iv) IRELAND 136
A. H. McNeile, D.D., formerly Regius Professor of Divinity, University of Dublin.

(v) THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA . 147
E. L. Parsons, D.D., Bishop of California.

(vi) CANADA 174
J. C. Roper, D.D., Bishop of Ottawa.

SEMINARY LIBRARY

PAGE
(vii) INDIA 200
E. J. Palmer, D.D., sometime Bishop of Bombay.
(viii) THE WEST INDIES 225
O. H. Parry, M.A., Bishop of Guiana.
(ix) AUSTRALIA 250
F. Goldsmith, D.D., sometime Bishop of Bunbury.
(x) NEW ZEALAND 262
J. M. Steward, M.A., sometime Bishop of Melanesia.
(xi) THE PROVINCE OF SOUTH AFRICA . 268
F. R. Phelps, D.D., Bishop of Grahamstown.

V. EPISCOPACY IN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH 291
C. A. H. Green, D.D., Bishop of Bangor.

VI. EPISCOPACY IN THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH 305
W. A. Wigram, D.D.

VII. EPISCOPACY IN THE CHURCH OF SWEDEN . 321
C. B. Moss, B.D.

VIII. EPISCOPACY IN THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCHES 335
C. B. Moss, B.D.

IX. THE CONTINUITY OF THE MINISTRY IN SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIANISM AND IN METHODISM, ENGLISH AND AMERICAN; WITH AN APPENDED NOTE ON THE MORAVIAN SUCCESSION . . . 343
H. N. Bate, M.A., Dean of Bocking.

X. EPISCOPACY AND REUNION 375
Darwell Stone, D.D.

XI. THE FREE CHURCHES AND EPISCOPACY . . 387
Sir Henry Lunn, M.A., M.D.

INDEX 403

PREFACE

THE reader who turns to the valuable 'Official Year-Book of the National Assembly of the Church of England' will look in vain for a section dealing with the Anglican Communion as a whole. If he prosecutes his researches he will find in summary form information illustrating various aspects of the work which is being carried on through its constituent parts. But the Lambeth Conferences, of which the seventh is being held in 1930, have focussed attention at intervals of approximately ten years upon a wider conception. That conception is not insular, for the bishops working within the British Isles are but a small fraction of the potential and, usually, of the actual members of such a conference. It is not imperial, for more than a quarter of the number are working outside the British Empire and own no fealty to the British Crown. It is not even in one sense a conception of the importance of a great assembly of English-speaking Christians from different parts of the globe, for the languages in which many of the members minister have no affinity with English and to some of themselves English is a foreign tongue. Nor, finally, is it primarily concerned with any formal dependence of more than three hundred bishops, some of whose dioceses are far larger than England, upon the see of Canterbury; for in the strict sense such dependence in the case of many of them has no existence. The 'alterius orbis Papa' has no means of constraining them even if he would, and he wields the greater power of influence because he does not seek to elaborate the machinery for its exercise, and is content to derive from the antiquity of his see not ascendency but the prerogative of service. But if this conception is of an organisation not insular but world-wide, not imperial but federal, not national but cosmopolitan, not monarchical nor even formally conciliar but consultative, there are also other notes of the organisation, at least in the view of its members, giving it an inherent unity within itself which justified, for example, the moving 'Appeal to all Christian People,' issued by the Conference of 1920.

In their own view beyond all question or discussion the members of the Conference were what they styled themselves 'Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England, in Conference assembled.' In appeal to Scripture, in adhesion to the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, in acceptance of the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself they did not doubt that they stood in the true line of the traditions of the Church. The Conference of 1888, following the lead of the General Convention of the American Church in 1886, had included these with some modification of phraseology as the first three sides of a 'Quadrilateral' which seemed to 'supply a basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made towards Home Reunion' and had accepted word for word its fourth article 'The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church.' In the Appeal of 1920 the bishops emphasised their belief 'that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve . . . a ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body,' and they asked 'May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry?' In justification of this they urged 'considerations alike of history and of present experience' and that the Episcopate 'is now and will prove to be in the future the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church.' And they added an expression of a great desire 'that the office of a bishop should everywhere be exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, and more truly express all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian Family in the title of Father-in-God.' There were not wanting those to whom it seemed that the claim for the Episcopate might have been much more strongly phrased, and some support was found for the view that the language was of a minimising tendency in the fact that it was placed side by side with the statement: 'It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communions which do not possess the Episcopate. On the contrary we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace.' But the student who stands aloof from controversy may well ask himself as he reads the whole Appeal how the bishops could have asserted more persuasively or with greater Christian charity their conviction that the Episcopate is 'the one means' for providing a ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church.

It is not the purpose of the present volume to make one more contribution to the already lengthy list of works which deal with the theory of the Christian ministry, its origin and development. Nor has it been constructed with a view to the applicability of any conclusions to which it may seem to lead to the conditions which underlie any particular scheme for reunion, whether in South India or elsewhere. The design of the original editors, the late Dr. A. E. Burn, Dean of Salisbury, and Mr. K. D. Mackenzie, was to supply an exposition of the practical working of episcopacy at different times and in different parts of the Church. In such an undertaking exact uniformity of treatment would have been difficult, perhaps impossible to secure: in any case it has not been attempted. Nor have the editors felt themselves limited in regard to those whose co-operation has been invited, and most willingly given, by considerations either of their own possible agreement or disagreement with the views which such writers might be supposed to hold on general or particular questions or of possible differences of opinion upon such matters among the contributors themselves. Each is responsible for his own contribution and for that alone; but so far as the book may be open to criticism in regard to the scale of treatment allowed in respect of one part as compared with another it should in fairness be attributed to the editors' failure to ' keep the mean ' which has been declared to be the wisdom of the Church of England.

It has been no less part of that wisdom to declare in the language of the Preface to the Ordinal that ' it is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church : Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which Offices were evermore had in such reverend Estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same ; and also by publick Prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority. And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the Church of England ; no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, . . . except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination.' As is well known this paragraph represents a notable enforcement by the revisers of 1661 of what they deemed to be the intention of those of 1550 and 1551 in their deductions from Holy Scripture and ancient Authors. And the statement is of the greater importance as a declaration of their judgment because they must be assumed to have been cognisant of those actions of some of their predecessors in the seventeenth century which are commonly alleged, rightly or wrongly, to indicate a less rigorous view. In any case, however, it is to be noted that like the earlier revisers they were grounding themselves not on hypothesis but on what they regarded as facts ascertainable from evidence open to all—that of the Holy Scripture and ' auncient aucthours.' If their position in one sense was weaker, in another it was immeasurably stronger than if they had made their view depend upon any scholastic theory. It is an attitude characteristically English, and in its appeal to the results of diligent reading not unworthy of the tradition of sound learning which has never been wholly lost sight of as an ideal of the Church of England both before and since the Reformation.

What was summarily pronounced to be ‘ evident unto all men ’ with the qualification of study in the sixteenth century could certainly not hope for the same general acceptance as historical fact in the twentieth. It is not always remembered that this is not in itself sufficient proof that the traditional mode of statement is untrue. Dr. Lowther Clarke in the opening essay of this book is probably open to a charge of exaggeration when he says that in regard to the origin of Episcopacy ‘ a writer must acknowledge that any reading of the evidence is unlikely to convince more than a minority of scholars,’ unless as is sometimes assumed the title of scholar is to be reserved for those who arrive at novel conclusions. Nor does he perhaps altogether do himself justice when he states that in his essay ‘ the facts will in a measure be arranged to illustrate the writer’s own theory.’ What he has written stands in the line of a great tradition of English scholarship just because the theory, be it right or wrong, has been excogitated not on *a priori* principles of his own but from a painful and independent examination of the evidence. That he has achieved rigorous impartiality no one who reads certain of the closing sections would venture to assert ; but in general he seems to go further than many other writers in the past or present in an effort to provide a statement which shall afford a reasonable explanation of several historical phenomena, all of which must be accounted for in any final elucidation of the problem. The student finds himself confronted with the varying estimates that have been formed of the importance and interpretation of well-known passages in the New Testament and in the corpus of writings conventionally labelled ‘ The Apostolic Fathers.’ If he isolates them for the purpose of discussion it must be with a constant reminder that such abstraction from environment, however convenient, may easily prove misleading both to himself and to others. He must be on his guard against treating as abnormal features which do not *prima facie* present themselves as such, lest by doing so he should achieve simplification at the cost of leaving out what he really had to explain. Nor must he too readily assume that terms are interchangeable in all circumstances because there are passages in which they seem to be applied to the same persons. Again, if he directs his attention not solely to the use of terms like 'episkopos,' 'presbuteros,' 'prophetes,' but to the careful examination of the application of other terms such as 'hiereus' and 'sacerdos,' and notes the functions attributed to the persons to whom those terms are applied, he will find another factor in the treatment of which he must exclude or at least make allowance for all instinctive bias due to later controversies. And certainly if he finds himself led to the view that at some period varying in different places one member of a college acting as its chairman and at first *primus inter pares* comes both to be set apart for that office by a special rite and to be regarded as belonging to a different order, his knowledge of human nature should be sufficient to make him regard the apparent absence of protests as at least as remarkable as the singular scantiness of evidence that anything of the kind ever happened. If Dr. Lowther Clarke leaves some of these points untouched he at any rate makes a vigorous attempt to deal with others, and if an even hypersensitive reaction to a critical atmosphere deprives him of some measure of freedom he lets loose at least one *ballon d'essai* in a treatment of the subject of Ordination which he describes with modest precision as 'a theory of my own.'

To the Bishop of Moray and Ross the editors are indebted for two essays. The first on 'The Position of Clergy and Laity in the Early Church in relation to the Episcopate' may be found to serve as a very instructive commentary on some aspects of what is sometimes regarded in our own day as a questionable or at least ambiguous phrase—the constitutional episcopate. When prelacy was defined, however inaccurately, in 'The Solemn League and Covenant' of 1643 as 'church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy' the definition represented a reaction against a system which, as is illustrated in another essay in this volume, on 'The Mediaeval Bishop,' had come to be regarded with something more than a show of justice as parent in working of intolerable abuses. Nearly a century earlier Latimer in a famous discourse had said 'Ye that be prelates loke well to your offyce, for right prelatynge is buisye labouryng and not lordyng,' but Latimer's criticisms had reference to the slothfulness of bishops, their neglect of preaching, or their preoccupation with secular concerns. The modern problem of securing, in the language of the bishops in 1920, a truer expression of 'all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian Family in the title of Father-in-God' is complicated by the form of language adopted, since children do not commonly elect their own fathers, and to speak of the exercise of the bishop's office in a 'representative and constitutional manner' is in one sense to borrow phraseology from a sphere of responsibility which is not really comparable. Yet the maintenance of the due relations of responsibility and activity between bishop, clergy and laity within the One Body is as necessary to the free course of the Lifegiving Spirit through every part as on the other hand impediments or lack of co-ordination are detrimental. But those who yield tacit acceptance to Pauline language on the subject do not always recognise that existing conditions, if tested by being brought into comparison with such a conception, would be seen at once to give ground for serious consideration. So far as remedy may be necessary it will be unlikely to be secured by insistence upon rights, and the sense of obligation is not easily requickened when the performance of duties by laymen has been reduced to a legal minimum. While all parties have long acquiesced in deploring the result, their attitude has been only too often that of *laudatores temporis acti* rather than that of men and women who have caught the vision of a present opportunity unparalleled in its hopefulness for those who seek to give rather than to receive.

The part taken by clergy and laity respectively in the common life of the Early Church, as the Bishop of Moray illustrates it, may well be compared with the statements contained in the articles dealing with the several areas of the Anglican Communion to-day. And the materials here collected for such a comparison may, it is hoped, prove the more valuable because in the assembly gathered in conference at Lambeth will be representatives of churches in which the legal nexus with the State has either never existed or has been severed either voluntarily or by force. It would be a strange reading of history which should throw upon association with the State all the responsibility for the Church's failures in its stewardship. No one denies that in the fourth century there was loss as well as gain in the State recognition which followed persecution, and some at least will admit that the Church has paid heavily in loss of spiritual influence for the secular aggrandisement and wealth which its bishops and other prelates and dignitaries have from time to time achieved in later centuries. But we must probe deeper still if we would reach the root of the mischief, and it is better to seek ways of renewal for the future than to spend time in possibly embittered controversy as to due apportionment of blame for the past. The sorely tried pastor who described himself as the dependent minister of an independent congregation belonged to a body which was neither established nor in one sense endowed, but neither is the spirit of autocracy wholly confined to those whose position or patrimony places them in the enjoyment of 'independent means.' Autocracy and leadership are not the same thing, and at the same time something more is involved in the historical conception of the bishop's office than that he should be a capable chairman of committees. When we come to consider the place which properly belongs to clergy and laity in a system episcopally governed we find that its recognition is far more likely to depend upon a common conception of the 'ethos' of the Church than upon precise definition. But there is a significant fact to which the Bishop of Moray points in his second article on 'The Present Working of Episcopacy in the Scottish Church.' When in regard to the vexed question of the position of the clergy and laity in legislation—vexed because of differences of opinion likely to arise as to the distinction of 'doctrinal' from 'non-doctrinal' matters—a commission of fifteen presbyters and fifteen laymen was set up it succeeded in producing in June 1904 a unanimous report. It is not less significant that while in the consultative council of that Church the three 'Orders' of bishops, clergy and laity may 'when desired, vote by Orders, and also debate by Orders,' the latter permission 'has not yet been made use of, and the former has happened only when the more important questions have been under discussion.' In the drafting and even more in the practical working of the constitutions of the Church of Ireland and the Church in Wales under conditions of disestablishment and disendowment the debt which both Churches owe to the able and devoted labours of distinguished laymen is probably greater than any words can adequately express. This does not mean that the constitutions themselves are perfect in either case. The reader may gather from Dr. McNeile's account of 'Episcopacy in the Church of Ireland' as well as possibly from his own observation that in some respects undue limitations have been imposed upon freedom, as from another angle he may think that they have been in the Church of South Africa, or as Bishop Seabury thought to have been done in the original plan for the organisation of the Episcopal Church in America.

It is a mark of a living Church as well as a condition of its continued life that while preserving essentials unaltered it should be able to adapt its machinery to the varying conditions of succeeding generations. But any value which may attach to such a statement will necessarily be dependent upon at least some measure of general agreement as to what the essentials are. In his 'Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine' Newman enumerated seven notes of a genuine development—(i) preservation of type, (ii) continuity of principles, (iii) power of assimilation, (iv) logical sequence, (v) anticipation of its future, (vi) conservative action upon its past, (vii) chronic vigour. How far he would have been willing that the same tests should be applied to organisation the reader may judge who reads the application of these notes in the famous sixth chapter to the existing developments of doctrine with its constant references, especially in the second section, to the meaning of the Catholic Church. ‘It may possibly be suggested,’ he says, ‘that this universality which the Fathers ascribe to the Catholic Church lay in its Apostolical descent, or again in its episcopacy; and that it was one, not as being one kingdom or civitas “at unity with itself,” with one and the same intelligence in every part, one sympathy, one ruling principle, one organisation, one communion, but because, though consisting of a number of independent communities, at variance (if so be) with each other even to a breach of communion, nevertheless all these were possessed of a legitimate succession of clergy, or all governed by bishops, priests and deacons. But who will in seriousness maintain that relationship, or that sameness of structure makes two bodies one? . . . If unity lies in the Apostolical succession, an act of schism is from the nature of the case impossible; for as no one can reverse his parentage, so no Church can undo the fact that its clergy have come by lineal descent from the Apostles. Either there is no such sin as schism, or unity does not lie in the Episcopal form or in the Episcopal ordination. And this is felt by the controversialists of this day; who in consequence are obliged to invent a sin, and to consider, not division of Church from Church, but the interference of Church with Church to be the sin of schism, as if local dioceses and bishops with restraint were more than ecclesiastical arrangements and by-laws of the Church, however sacred, while schism is a sin against her essence. Thus they strain out a gnat and swallow a camel. Division is the schism, if schism there be, not interference. If interference is a sin, division which is the cause of it is a greater; but where division is a duty, there can be no sin in interference. Far different from such a theory is the picture which the ancient Church presents to us; true, it was governed by bishops, and those bishops came from the Apostles, but it was a kingdom besides; and as a kingdom admits of the possibility of rebels, so does such a Church involve sectaries and schismatics, but not in dependent portions. . . . Its bishops were not mere local officers, but possessed a quasi-œcumenical power, extending wherever a Christian was to be found,' and he quotes from Bingham St. Gregory Nazianzen's description of Cyprian as 'presiding not only over the Church of Carthage and Africa, but over all the regions of the West, and over the East, and South, and Northern parts of the world also,' with the comment 'This is evidence of a unity throughout Christendom, not of mere origin or of Apostolical succession, but of government,' while guarding himself in a note against seeming to accept the statement of St. Gregory with Bingham's view of it as at variance with the Papal supremacy. For this purpose it has to become 'a rhetorical discourse' and to be contrasted with 'a synodal enunciation as at Chalcedon.' Although admitting readily enough the accuracy of the description we may venture to doubt if even rhetoric would have attempted such a flight had the ordinary Roman theory of Papal supremacy ever been present to St. Gregory's mind.

The essays on 'Episcopacy in the Roman Catholic Church' by the Bishop of Bangor and on 'Episcopacy in the Orthodox Church' by Dr. Wigram have a common characteristic which lays them open to a facile criticism, in that neither is written by a scholar who belongs to the body whose theory and practice he is describing. There are not, however, wanting correctives, if in minor points of statement such should seem necessary, and the editors have on their part to express to the writers very sincere gratitude for their attempt to give as careful and objective a study as possible of the subjects entrusted to them. Dr. Green has set himself, in his own words, 'to describe, as accurately as possible, Episcopacy as it is to-day in the Roman Catholic Church' rather than to give an account of the successive steps by which the powers of the episcopate have been brought into their present relation to those of the Pope. Such an account would have required much greater space, even allowing for the mastery of compression which he shares with the Bishop of Moray, and students who are familiar with the great mass of biographies and other works which, during the last quarter of a century, have made English readers acquainted with the working of the system, at least in England and Ireland, will appreciate the advantages and disadvantages which belong to it as an instrument of government. That is of course a quite different question from that of the validity of the premisses from which it is deduced, or even from that of the consistency of the theory of the episcopate enunciated at the opening of his article with restrictions increasingly imposed upon its practical operation.

In writing upon the Orthodox Church Dr. Wigram has a subject to the study of which he has devoted his life. It would not be easy to devise a more striking contrast than is to be found in the illustration of Eastern and Western mentalities afforded by his article and the Bishop of Bangor's. And if the criticism should occur to anyone that he has made the Orthodox Church too Anglican in appearance, the answer probably is that, while the resemblances have in many respects a real existence, Dr. Wigram's essay will also be found on further reading to include both implicitly and explicitly very numerous points of difference. When, however, we turn from external considerations to examine the writer's statement of what he considers to be the approach of the 'orthodox-trained' mind to the problems of the nature of the Church, the sacraments, the concept of authority and the doctrine of 'economy,' the English reader finds himself according to his temperament and upbringing, even possibly his ancestry, either repelled if he has what is sometimes called a 'scholastic mind,' or extraordinarily and most powerfully attracted. He is not likely to be perturbed by what may seem to some to be casual in phrasing or lacking in logic, for as a rule he cares more for content than form and has in general a whole-hearted disbelief in logic as ordinarily understood. There are probably many both inside and outside the Anglican Communion to whom this essay will prove quite unexpectedly not only the most interesting in the book but also the one most likely to provide matter for discussion in relations other than those with which Dr. Wigram himself has been occupied. How far such application may be legitimate may of course be equally arguable, but the writer has at least the not too common merit of defining positions in such a way that observers do not feel an instinctive reaction towards disagreement, if only disagreement should prove decently justifiable. The strength of the Orthodox position is in the firmness of its representation of the concept of the Body and of the Spirit of Love in the Body as having power ; and sentences of exposition as to validity of sacraments or Apostolic succession which, read apart from the sense of that context, could make reunion more difficult will receive in consequence closer consideration, even if the result should not always be acquiescence. In some respects difference of circumstances makes a division which may at first sight seem strange, *e.g.* in regard to the relation of clergy and bishop in the Eastern Churches. 'Certain conditions,' Dr. Wigram says, 'are universal in all Orthodox communities, as, for instance, the custom—for I know of no canon that lays down the law on the subject—that bishops should always be unmarried and therefore usually monks.' The laity have, or seem to have, for the most part, a more effective voice in the choice of their clergy than clergy and laity have in the election of a bishop, since in the case of the parish priest the laity are at least making themselves responsible for a single person and have, as is pointed out, to take the full consequences of their action should the choice prove unfortunate, in as much as the bishop's control is strictly limited. And the Eastern Churches in general have suffered so much from external control that it is hardly surprising if bishops have often had to be content with following the line of least resistance.

It will not, however, be supposed that the Eastern Churches have been peculiar in such limitations. The Acts of Uniformity in England are not strictly a parallel, since those Acts at least represented what was, at one time at any rate, the general standpoint both of English ecclesiastical authorities and of English churchmen. But it would be difficult to conceive of any body of English-speaking people, whether episcopally governed or otherwise, whether ministers or laymen, submitting to a system whereby 'every year a series of texts for all the Sundays is officially issued, and all the clergy throughout the country must preach on the text for the day.' Mr. C. B. Moss, from whose description of 'Episcopacy in Sweden' this illustration is taken, treats it as one of the pieces of evidence that in Sweden 'the connection between Church and State is closer than in any other European country,' but without suggesting that any objection is raised; nor except for the manner in which it is imposed is the practice of uniformity of text entirely without ancient precedent. But this is not the only respect in which the position of the Church of Sweden is peculiar. The Lambeth Conference of 1920 entered into closer relations with it, but, as Mr. Moss points out, the 'Augustana Synod,' its daughter Church in America, is Presbyterian in government, and while its Indian mission has a bishop, its other missions in China and South Africa have not, and he adds that while 'the European missionaries are ordained by a bishop before sailing . . . as far as I have been able to discover, the native pastors receive Presbyterian ordination; hitherto the South African mission has only had one such native pastor.' The seriousness of the questions thus raised, as also in regard to the Swedish attitude to confirmation, should neither be neglected nor exaggerated. Neither is a matter which is likely to be treated as indifferent in a reunited Church, but how far these or similar considerations were present to the minds of the bishops in 1920 it is probably now superfluous to inquire, even if the information were likely to be available. The subjects of this diaconate and of confirmation were clearly before them. In any case their action evoked far less of comment, whether favourable or unfavourable, than might have been expected, and from no quarter has there been, so far as we are aware, any considered protest that the witness either of the Swedish Church or of the Anglican Communion to the historical principles for which it stands has been in anywise impaired. The Conference formally accepted the conclusions of its committee on the succession of the bishops of the Church of Sweden and the conception of the priesthood set forth in its standards, and recommended (*a*) that 'members of that Church, qualified to receive the Sacrament in their own Church, should be admitted to Holy Communion in ours,' and (*b*) that 'on suitable occasions permission should be given to Swedish ecclesiastics to give addresses in our churches.' Questions of reunion are not matters of bargaining, even though the concord may be registered in a document; and from whatever quarter overtures for closer union among bodies of Christians may come the onus rests upon those who refuse at any rate to explore possibilities. By the terms of this resolution and by the following one of agreement, if invited, to take part in a Swedish consecration the bishops in the Conference acted on what seemed in their judgment to be the principles of Christian comity, with confidence that they were in no wise imperilling further reunion. At the same time they safeguarded, as they were legitimately entitled and even bound to do, those of their own number who might feel difficulties by including in the resolution on intercommunion a statement which may well serve as a useful precedent, viz. 'If the authorities of any province of the Anglican Communion find local irregularities in the order or practice of the Church of Sweden outside that country, they may legitimately, within their own region, postpone any such action as is recommended in this Resolution until they are satisfied that these irregularities have been removed.' The moral impressiveness of the resolutions of a body like the Lambeth Conference is but little affected by the fact that they carry no synodical sanctions and neither bind provinces nor constrain the conscience of individual bishops; but the deliberations afford ample opportunity for ascertaining the views of the members on the question whether this or that course of action proposed is one which commands a considerable measure of agreement or is temporarily unwise or is permanently excluded by reference to larger aspects of the subject as a whole. In such circumstances pettiness of mind is unlikely to be confused with fidelity to truth, and if to ardent spirits progress may seem slow, final agreement when reached at each stage carries the whole movement forward with an impetus unchecked by further breaches which might easily have been produced by action felt by any considerable minority to have been precipitate and ill-considered.

Precipitate action is nearly always ill-advised, and as is shown both in the resolutions of 1920 and in the article by Mr. Moss in this volume on ‘Episcopacy in the Old Catholic Churches,’ the bishops of the Anglican Communion, more especially in England, had themselves been placed in a difficult position by the consecration of Mr. Arnold Mathew by the Church of Holland in 1908 as an Old Catholic Bishop for England. Bishop Mathew’s subsequent proceedings were entirely contrary to any theory of Catholic Order, and the English bishops adopted the only possible course in refusing to recognise in any way either the ordinations of clergy or consecrations of other bishops for which he made himself responsible. At the same time the bishops at the Conference expressed in a resolution their desire as before ‘to maintain and strengthen the friendly relations which exist between the Churches of the Anglican Communion and the ancient Church of Holland and the Old Catholic Churches, especially in Germany, Switzerland and Austria.’ A further *rapprochement* has taken place since the Lambeth Conference of 1920 owing to the fact that, as Mr. Moss points out, the Bishops’ Conference of the whole Old Catholic Communion at Berne in 1925 accepted the validity of Anglican Orders, as all the different Old Catholic Churches had already done.

The remaining essays in this volume will be found to fall into four main divisions. In the first may be placed a lengthy study in which the Dean of Bocking, Mr. H. N. Bate, who was one of the secretaries of the Lausanne Conference in 1927 and editor of its Report, describes the development of the Presbyterian theory and polity in Scotland and that of the Methodist Church, including the Methodist Episcopal body, with an added note on the *Unitas Fratrum* or Moravians, relations with whom have been the subject of discussion at previous Conferences and in their committees. In regard to this section also the editors judged it better to obtain an objective statement from a scholar whose ability and fairness of mind have won general recognition than to impose upon separate contributors from those Churches a restriction of space which however necessary might reasonably have been regarded as a hardship. The responsibility for limitation must rest with the editors rather than with Mr. Bate, whose performance of a very difficult task will, they think, be examined with very great interest by readers. It will be found to offer some useful points for comparison with portions of the essays by Dr. Lowther Clarke and the Bishops of Moray and of California.

In the second division to which we have referred may be placed articles on 'Episcopacy in the United States of America' by the Bishop of California, in Canada by the Bishop of Ottawa, in India by Dr. Palmer, sometime Bishop of Bombay, in Australia by Dr. Goldsmith, sometime Bishop of Bunbury, in South Africa by the Bishop of Grahamstown, in the Province of the West Indies by the Bishop of Guiana, in New Zealand by Mr. J. M. Steward, sometime Bishop of Melanesia. As was perhaps to be expected, the treatment in these essays proceeds in the main upon historical lines. Indeed, except perhaps in the case of the first, the course of the development could hardly be understood without at least an outline of such knowledge. If English churchmen are led as they read this series of chapters of what is in some respects a fascinating story to reflect upon the curiousness of the ways of their forefathers, whose sense of orderliness and system led them to include the North American continent in the Diocese of London and Australasia in the Archdeaconry of Calcutta, they will be ungrateful if they do not recognise at the same time the generosity with which the past has been treated by those who have taken in hand the description of modern conditions in these great Churches overseas which occupy so notable a place in the common life of the Anglican Communion to-day. There is in one of the articles already referred to earlier an enigmatic statement that among the Old Catholics 'each national Church is governed by its own constitution. There are two types of constitution: that of the German and Czecho-Slovak Old Catholic Churches, in which the bishop has considerable powers, and that of the Swiss and Austrian Old Catholic Churches, which is more democratic.' In the case of these English-speaking Churches each has had an opportunity in the course of its history of framing for itself with greater or less freedom a constitution of its own. For many of these the volume entitled 'Constitutional Church Government in the Dominions,' which was the *magnum opus* of Dr. Lowther Clarke's father, the late Archbishop of Melbourne, has afforded a convenient means of comparison, while Dr. Eyre Chatterton's 'History of the Church in India' and Mr. R. A. Giles' very useful book on 'The Constitutional History of the Australian Church' may serve to carry on the story.

Readers of these chapters, especially in England, will observe with interest the points of contrast and of similarity which they present with conditions to which we are ourselves accustomed and under which we are sometimes supposed to be far more seriously hampered than is in fact the case. Each of these Churches has its own problems and in some there are peculiar difficulties which necessarily call for special treatment, but in general the points of similarity outnumber the differences. When each in turn is compared with the English system opinions may vary as to the side to which the balance of advantages inclines. There are some who will think that a written constitution as distinct from the standard of formularies has advantages in securing orderliness and discipline; there are others who may find it something of a burden unless the provisions are more elastic than those of written constitutions are wont to be. The American Church has had a position of unequalled opportunity in regard to experiment in this direction or that, and the article by the Bishop of California has therefore special value for the student, a value which is enhanced both by its methodical arrangement and its frankness in statement of merits and defects or at least of possibilities of improvement. The same kind of interest attaches *mutatis mutandis* to the course of development in Canada and in India, and especially in the former, which represents in a sense a continuation of two systems. There is one point which may occur to readers of the article by the Bishop of Ottawa, viz. that the judgment sometimes passed on those who framed Letters Patent from the Crown has possibly been more severe than the facts warrant. There are obvious difficulties which these provisions have caused in relation to India, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, but anyone who extricates from the luxuriant masses of legal verbiage the outlines of the several schemes as he ploughs his way through the Patent Rolls or Archiepiscopal Act Books is likely to feel a much greater respect than is sometimes expressed for the well-intentioned efforts to provide an orderly framework for extension. So far as they failed it was largely through a certain lack of imagination in relation to the difficulties of transplanting overseas the machinery and discipline of the Church at home. Where indeed these have established themselves the results sometimes look strangely antiquated. Thus the Bishop of Guiana writes of the diocese of Barbados that it 'has changed its constitution in Church and State less than almost any part of the British Empire. The island is still governed by vestries, and so the appointment of the bishop is still influenced by its constitution.' The vestry conception of government will always find a certain number of supporters, but the Church at home has at least ostensibly got rid of it and no one dreams of it as a possible system for a reunited Church. Yet the decision in such matters is for the local Church, and reunion is no more likely to be promoted by a crusade against anomalies than education would be by imposing upon Winchester or Westminster the external appearance of a modern 'provided school.' And if the Gregorian maxim 'non pro locis res sed pro bonis rebus loca amanda sunt' is capable of many applications it had at least the implication that Christian Churches might learn one from another and that uniformity was not the only thing to be considered.

The essay by the Bishop of Southwark on 'Episcopacy in the Church of England' may fairly be placed in a division by itself since, even though many of the problems with which it deals are common to most parts of the Anglican Communion, there are factors inherent in the position of the Church of England as the result of the history of more than thirteen centuries which enter into the question of their solution in a way not found generally elsewhere. The difficulties of dealing with such a subject are obvious. In the exposition of the system the writer must inevitably find himself dealing with matters of fact, of history and of law, in regard to all of which differences of opinion have frequently been expressed. Any observations which he may make by way of criticism will be legitimately open to comment and may easily, if not so legitimately, be given practical application to episcopal policy in current affairs. Moreover, a diocesan bishop in discussing questions which have lately been the battle-ground of acute controversy and which concern issues that he cannot but regard as of serious importance must necessarily feel responsibility in relation to those who disagree with his personal views as well as to those who share them. As former vicar of Portsea and present bishop of one of the most arduous dioceses in England, Dr. Garbett had abundant reasons available either for accepting or refusing the request which the editors ventured to make, but they do not think that there is likely to be any division of opinion as to the value and importance of his contribution of what they themselves regarded as probably the most difficult chapter in the book.

The fourth division to which reference has been made includes two articles—'Episcopacy and Reunion' by the Principal of Pusey House, Dr. Darwell Stone, and 'The Free Churches and Episcopacy' by Sir Henry Lunn, the editor of *The Review of the Churches*. There was a sentence in one of the speeches at the Lausanne Conference which suggested a criticism to which it is in every way desirable that attention should be paid: 'The reunion of Christendom will never be accomplished by ambiguity of language or concealment of thought.' Since it is the purpose of this volume to collect materials for comparison and judgment it seemed to the editors desirable to invite expressions of opinion on the place of Episcopacy in relation to Reunion from two writers who would state the issue as it appeared to them from two different points of view. The two statements are quite independent, and to each of the writers the editors offer their sincere thanks.

Since the Lausanne Conference of 1927 the conviction has deepened that Reunion can only be hoped for on a basis of Episcopacy. If and so far as this is true, as well as for other reasons, a study of the practical working of the episcopal method of government in divers ages and lands may commend itself to the consideration of those to whom it is unfamiliar or who are for historical reasons disposed to regard it with dislike. But it is not less important that Anglicans, at any rate, should form clear ideas as to what is essential and what is accidental in the system to which they attach such importance as to regard it as a means whereby Christians may be led to unity and held in fellowship in a united Church.

Is it merely rhetoric to urge that we should have ever present in our hearts the thought of that union for which our Lord prayed and raise our eyes to the vision of what the glories of a united Church might be? Only so shall we be nerved and strengthened for the dangers and inevitable tedium of our pilgrimage towards them. In the first place, the energies now devoted to the competition of warring denominations will be set free for the fight against the real enemy. It is conventional to call that enemy secularism, but we need to distinguish. Those who sat at the feet of Baron von Hügel were taught to recognise two loyalties—to God who made the world, and to the world which God made and in which He has placed them. If it were not for the bad flavour that the word has acquired they would contend that in this sense, at least, ‘ secularism ’ is as necessary to the development of the normal man as ‘ religion,’ and out of the poise and strain of the two loyalties God’s man is shaped and moulded for the work to which God has set him. A disunited Church with dissipated energies can never face its task of claiming and redeeming secular culture. If we want a phrase for the ideal the Abbé Bremond provides it in the ‘ Devout Humanism ’ described in the first volume of his history of religious thought in France. Believers in the Incarnation must be humanists, and they will try to be devout. There was a brief era in French history when Catholicism proved spacious enough to be a home for the true spirit of the Renaissance, and in the twentieth century, which is witnessing a rebirth in so many departments of human life and thought, the Church may surely hope and pray for the guidance of the Spirit in its mission to a new world. It is too strait a conception to regard the Church as called merely to pick up the threads that were dropped when Erasmus died. To every age it has to proclaim the Gospel, and in every age it can do so effectually if it holds firmly to the conviction that the God whose revelation it is seeking to interpret is the God of Truth. The Church of God can never be obscurantist.

Secondly, the reunited Church would be a great school of Love. At present our lesson-books are elementary. The difficulties, in themselves comparatively trivial, which arise in the common life of each individual community will be replaced by an urgent need for understanding new disciplines and accustoming ourselves to languages as yet unfamiliar or at best only partially apprehended. But when Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, Anglicans, Baptists, Methodists, Congregationalists and others with strongly marked individuality and centuries old traditions live and work together, situations will arise in which nothing but heroic love, long-suffering, keeping silence at times even from good words, will prevent disaster. It may, indeed, seem to many that we shall be living dangerously in this new adventure of Love, but in the power of that love and trust which will come when one and all are seeking to live more closely in union one with another in the service of one Lord, holding one Faith, acknowledging one Baptism, the Church will achieve the greatness which is implied in its dignity as the Body of Christ.

Again, Missions purged from any self-regarding element, any desire to promote the cause or to swell the ranks of any particular denomination, will gain immeasurably in sincerity and power as they bear a united witness to the truths of the Gospel which they set forth in their Master's Name and propose to all who will hear no aim less noble than the extension of the frontiers of the Kingdom of God. The nations are slowly feeling their way towards a dim, far-off ideal of an ultimate world-state which shall conserve the values alike of unity and diversity. The Church is crippled as well as woefully impeded if its members allow themselves to cherish ideals of self-aggrandisement which in all secular relations the best spirits are learning to discard.

The 'Appeal to all Christian People' issued by the Bishops of the Anglican Communion in 1920 expressed the desire for unity by which they felt themselves to be so strongly moved. They did not doubt that others felt it too, and if the response, though courteous, has yielded as yet less evident results than might have been hoped by some, we can scarcely doubt that at least the thought of what unity might mean has come to awaken questionings in the minds of those who pronounce the matter settled once for all, as well as of those who judge methods impracticable or times inopportune. But there is another consideration which we ourselves shall do well to face. It might be urged that the representatives of a communion which is commonly supposed to be always living in crisis were strange pioneers of a new movement for Reunion. Quite apart from the fact that the Bishops in the Lambeth Conference never proposed Anglicanism as the ideal for a united Church is the question of the divisions which diminish effectiveness and are a source of controversy among ourselves. No one who loves the Church of England would deny that there are from time to time differences and conflicts within its borders which violate the law of Love and need to be confessed with shame and penitence. But it is both necessary and just to insist that crisis and the tension from which, in von Hügel's sense, the finest spirituality may arise are not in every sense wholly to be deplored. It is true of the Church of England to-day, some would even say that it is its glory, that it is attempting to hold in one communion practically all the elements for which a place would have to be found in a reunited Church. These elements may seem to some jarring and unharmonised, but of the ideal at least Anglicans may be proud, if not of the success with which it is realised. For many days to come crisis must continue unless the attempt be given up in despair. The break-up not so much of Anglicanism but of what Anglicanism stands for, so far from promoting Reunion, would lead many to regard it as an idle dream. Once in God's ordering of the world a community for which a destiny of unexampled importance was being prepared was called upon to suffer for others. The ideal Israel was the righteous servant of Jehovah, of whom the Prophet, as he pictured the nations looking upon him with wonder, wrote : 'There is no beauty that we should desire him. . . . He was despised, and we esteemed him not.' Though this prophecy was later put to the holiest of all uses, it may be used without irreverence even in a modern application. Metaphors and similes are often overdone and may easily be misleading. But there is at least something to be said for the view of the Anglican Communion not so much as a bridge-church as a microcosm. Under the system a description of which occupies the bulk of the present volume is being worked out on a small scale an experiment which the Great Church of the future may one day have to repeat on a world-wide scale.

EPISCOPACY
ANCIENT AND MODERN

I

THE ORIGINS OF EPISCOPACY

By W. K. Lowther Clarke

A convincing theory of the origin of Episcopacy cannot be formulated in our present state of knowledge. A writer must acknowledge that any reading of the evidence is unlikely to convince more than a minority of scholars. Perhaps beginnings, here as in other cases, must always be mysteries 'wrought in the silence of God.' But this particular path has been so well trodden by investigators that a mere repeating of the data seems hardly worth the trouble involved. Progress is possible only if students, after honest weighing of evidence, venture to describe the development that seems to them most probable. Apart from the discovery of the 'Didache,' very little has come to light since the days of Lightfoot's 'Commentary on the Philippians'; but some familiar passages have gradually come to look different, as successive writers have studied them afresh.

In the following essay, then, the facts will in a measure be arranged to illustrate the writer's own theory. This is inevitable if the discussion is to be kept within bounds. It seems better to follow this course, warning the reader at the outset, than to strive after a completely objective treatment which would probably be doomed to failure. The thesis to be set forth is briefly as follows.

The early Church at Jerusalem had a type of organisation, developed under the eyes of the Apostles, which, in two generations or so, probably with the approval of the surviving Apostles, became fixed in Antioch and Western Asia Minor, and presently was adopted everywhere. It is reasonable to suppose that this represents the main line of development. If so, the key to the problem is to be sought in the original community of Jerusalem, and in Jewish customs. This line of approach differs from that commonly taken by Protestant scholars, who start from St. Paul's Epistles, and look upon conditions at Jerusalem as exceptional. They would probably argue that eventually, with the failure of the second century to understand St. Paul, a certain Judaising of the Church took place. What they consider a declension from high spiritual ideals I see as a natural spread of the earliest form of organisation as the time for missionary experiments, carefully supervised by the missionary, passed away.

I. Old Testament and Later Jewish Antecedents.—(a) *Apostles.* Since Apostolical Succession is part of our subject, the Jewish 'apostle' must not be neglected.[1] In the Persian period, for which 1 and 2 Chron. may be taken as evidence, *shalach* ('send') was a technical term for the 'authorisation and appointment of persons with a specific range of jurisdiction (at a distance from the authorising power) and duty, to act as plenipotentiary representatives.'[2]

In 2 Chron. xvii. 7–9 Jehoshaphat *sends* official teachers of the law. In xix. 5 he *appoints* (*ya'amid*) judges—the shade of meaning is different. In xxx. 1 Hezekiah *sends* emissaries with full powers, this act being distinguished from the sending of official letters. The plan would have to be assumed, even if there was no evidence, in order to explain the cohesion of Judaism. It was taken over from the Persian State administration. The link between the Persian and

---

[1] What follows is derived mainly from F. Gavin's art., 'Shaliach and Apostolos,' in *Anglican Theological Review*, January 1927; see also Strack-Billerbeck's *Kommentar zum N.T.*, iii. 2–4; Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism*, pp. 37–39; Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, i. 408 ff.; *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, art. 'Apostle'; and Lietzmann on Rom. i. 1 in *Handbuch zum N.T.* (3rd ed.).

[2] Vogelstein, quoted by Gavin.

Jewish systems is clearly seen in the Assuan Papyri, No. 21,[1] where King Darius sends word to the Jewish garrison instructing them when to keep the Passover.

In later centuries there were 'congregational apostles,' concerned with the collection of contributions for the headquarters of Judaism[2]; these were eventually given formal recognition in Roman law.[3] There is no clear evidence for the institution in the intervening period before the destruction of the Temple. But various New Testament passages seem to presuppose it. In St. Mark iii. 14, 'he *appointed* twelve,' the word (ἐποίησε) represents the technical Rabbinic term. St. John xiii. 16, 'neither is one that is sent (ἀπόστολος) greater than he that sent him,' seems to be a free translation of the Rabbinic: 'The sent (*shalucho*) of a man is as himself.' The roving commission of St. Mark vi. 7, exercised at a distance, recalls that of the Jewish apostolate; at the end of the commission the Twelve report to Him who sent them. In Acts ix. 1 Saul seeks letters of authorisation (such as are frequently met with in Rabbinic sources) for his journey as a plenipotentiary. The disciples go two by two, as do Paul and Barnabas later—so did the Jewish apostles. Epaphroditus is the 'apostle' of the Philippian Church, ministering to St. Paul's need, that is, bringing contributions like the 'congregational apostles.' The story of St. Paul's organising of a gift for the saints at Jerusalem reads like a transferring to a new object of the contributions to headquarters customary in Judaism. The natural conclusion from all this is that the Christian apostolate was a normal development of the Jewish.

(b) *Overseers* (*episcopi*).[4] Something must be said to justify the importance attached to the Septuagint in this essay. The problem of the ministry first presented itself in connection with the Greek-speaking Jews at Jerusalem, that is, in circles where the Greek version of the Old Testament was used. We naturally expect to find some influence of the LXX on the development of Christian institutions. Our expectation is confirmed by a study of St. Luke's writings. The first two chapters of the Gospel are shot through with LXX reminiscences. The Acts, as I have tried to prove elsewhere,[1] shows a two-fold influence of the LXX. The speeches in the first half of the book are strongly Septuagintal, in the second half far less so. The LXX colouring in the narrative is practically confined to the first half; it is specially marked in viii.–xii. The inference is that the chief source of the reminiscences is the Palestinian sources used by the author.

---

[1] Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri*, p. 63.

[2] *Cf.* Philo, *De Mon.* p. 224 M. (ἱεροπομποὶ τῶν χρημάτων); *cf.* Jos. *Ant.* XVIII. ix. 1.

[3] See *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 8, 14: 'Archisynagogi sive presbyteri Judaeorum vel quos ipsi apostolos vocant, qui ad exigendum aurum atque argentum a Patriarcho certo tempore diriguntur' (dated 399).

[4] In what follows 'bishop' will be used to denote the head of a local Church organised on an indubitably mon-episcopal basis, 'episcopus' to translate the word ἐπίσκοπος whenever the meaning is clearly, or possibly, different.

The *word* 'episcopus' is used occasionally in the LXX in the general sense of 'overseer': the *ideas* which lie behind it in the New Testament are clearly brought out in two important passages which had a great influence on Christian thought. Jer. vi. 17, 18 in the LXX becomes a prophecy of the Gentile mission: 'I have set watchmen (σκοπούς) over you, hear ye the voice of the trumpet; and they said, We will not hear. Therefore the Gentiles heard, and they that tend their flocks.'[2] The watchmen are equated with the shepherds. The other passage is Ezek. xxxiii.–xxxiv., the great warning to the watchmen and shepherds of Israel, who for their unfaithfulness will be replaced by the true Shepherd, Jehovah Himself. 'If the watchman (σκοπός) sees the sword coming and gives not a warning with the trumpet, and the people are not protected, and the sword comes and takes a soul (life) of any of them; it has been taken because of its iniquity, and the blood from the hand of the watchman will I require' (xxxiii. 6). 'O shepherds of Israel, do shepherds feed themselves? Do not shepherds feed the sheep? Behold, ye eat the milk and are clothed with the wool and kill the fatlings, and my sheep ye feed not . . . Behold, I will seek out my sheep and visit them (as an overseer, ἐπισκέψομαι). As a shepherd seeketh [1] his flock . . .' (xxxiv. 2, 11, 12).

---

[1] See 'The Use of the Septuagint in Acts,' in *The Beginnings of Christianity* (Foakes-Jackson and Lake), vol. ii.

[2] Here, as below, the LXX is translated from Swete's text. A Palestinian shepherd's life would be largely concerned with watching for wild beasts; *cf.* Gen. xxxi. 39; 1 Sam. xvii. 34, 35. An ἐπίσκοπος would perforce be a σκοπός. The Good Shepherd has to watch for wolves, John x. 12.

Turning to the New Testament occurrences of episcopus and cognate words, we notice in more than one instance a context seemingly influenced by the passages just quoted. Thus Acts xx. 26 ff. : 'I am pure from the blood of all men (*cf.* Ezek. xxxiii. 6) . . . Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you episcopi, to feed the Church of God,[2] which he purchased with his own blood. I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock. . . . Wherefore watch ye . . .' The conception is, directly or indirectly, derived from the prophets, with episcopi substituted for *scopi*, 'watchmen.' The same thoughts recur in 1 Peter ii. 25, 'the Shepherd and Episcopus of your souls' ; and in v. 2–4 : 'Tend the flock of God, acting as episcopi (ἐπισκοποῦντες), not of constraint, but willingly. . . . And when the chief Shepherd shall be manifested. . . .'

Further, the qualifications of a bishop in the Pastorals closely resemble those of the *parnaṣ*. This late Hebrew word, formed from the Greek πρόνοος or προνοητής, means a shepherd or overseer. The individual members of the seven rulers of a town were called *parnaṣim*. They were specially concerned with charitable relief.[3] A Jewish writer calls attention to the thoroughly Jewish character of the bishop's qualifications in the 'Didascalia.' [4] A few quotations will prove illuminating. 'Of bishops we have heard thus from our Lord Jesus Christ, that the shepherd of the sheep who is ordained bishop of all the Churches must needs be blameless, pure and good, who thinketh not on the care of this world, who is full fifty years old. . . . For the Lord spake by the mouth of Ezekiel the prophet, and said (a large part of chapter xxxiii. is quoted). . . . The watchman is the bishop of the Holy Church.'[1]

---

[1] But the text known to N.T. writers was probably ἐπισκέπτεται (visits, as an overseer), the reading of A. The N.T. quotations of the LXX generally follow the A text as against the B ; *cf.* Swete, *Intr. to the LXX*, p. 399.

[2] This recalls Jehovah, the true Shepherd, in Ezekiel.

[3] See Strack-Billerbeck, ii. 641 ff.

[4] *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, art. 'Didascalia' (Kohler).

This is probably enough to show how largely the Early Church conception of the episcopus was coloured by the Old Testament. A passage in 1 Cor. incidentally reveals St. Paul's mind working along the same lines and finding the Christian ministry in the Old Testament. 'Who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk[2] of the flock? . . . Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn. Is it for the oxen that God careth, or saith he it altogether for our sake?' (ix. 7–10).

(c) *Presbyters.*[3] The elders (*zĕqēnim*, πρεσβύτεροι) were a prominent feature in first-century Judaism.[4] They formed a collegiate organisation which was at the head of every Jewish community. The collegiate body was known as a Sanhedrin (γερουσία), which outside Palestine had a president (γερουσιάρχης). The Palestinian Sanhedrins seem not to have had regular presidents, but the head Sanhedrin at Jerusalem had an *ex officio* one in the High Priest.

These elders were judges and teachers of the various Jewries, expounding and administering the Torah, which was conceived of as a living and growing body of instruction, continually modified to meet changing needs. But its basis was the Law of Moses, and careful training in both the original Law and the tradition was necessary before a man could take office.

The outward symbol of the tradition inherited from Moses was ordination, the laying on of hands (*ṣĕmīkhah*).

---

[1] *Ethiopic Didascalia*, iv. (ed. Harden, pp. 12 ff.); *cf.* Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, pp. 36 f.

[2] *Cf.* Ezek. xxxiv. 2.

[3] See Strack-Billerbeck, ii. 648 ff.; Friedländer, *Synagoge und Kirche in ihren Anfängen*; *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, art. 'Ordination'; Gavin, *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments*; Easton, 'Jewish and Christian Ordination,' in *Anglican Theological Review* (1923–4).

[4] There is no serious objection to taking some details of the following summary from a rather later period. In the second half of the third century ordination began to die out, probably by reaction against its use in the Church. It is probable that the feeling which prompted its abandonment existed earlier, so that a second-century development of ordination seems unlikely. Jewish scholars are always protesting that second-century Judaism was substantially identical with that of the first century before A.D. 70, and in this particular at least they seem to be right.

This, by a kind of 'apostolical succession,' was supposed (with what justification is irrelevant to our purpose) to go back to Joshua, who had himself been ordained by Moses. The ordinand was chosen from the 'disciples of the scholars.' Before A.D. 133 an individual scholar might ordain his own students.

The later practice is given by Tosefta Sanhedrin: 'The *ṣemikha* is to be decided by three, and the laying on of the elders' hands by three; but R. Jehuda holds that it is by five' (i. 1).[1] Probably one scholar ordained, the others acting as assessors or witnesses, so that there was no difference in principle between the practice before and after 133.[2] Great importance was attached to the action of R. Jehuda b. Baba, who soon after 135 ordained five scholars of R. Aquiba, and thus prevented the continuity of succession from being broken. In the third century ordination became a privilege of the Patriarch and his colleagues. No formula seems to have been used. The main idea was that the spirit of Moses passed to his successors, as a torch from one man to another, without, however, any diminution of the spirit in the ordainer. There is no evidence that a gift of the Holy Spirit, in anything like the Christian sense, was supposed to be given. Ordination conveyed '"character," and was not repeated on promotion to a more important Sanhedrin; once an elder, always an elder.'[3] The whole conception was radically different from that of the priesthood, which was hereditary.

Lastly, let us note that ordination was confined to Palestine. In the third century the Jewish leaders in Babylonia maintained their right to appoint official teachers otherwise, but this did not affect the rule formulated by R. Joshua b. Levi (*c.* 250): 'There is no ordination outside the (holy) land.'[4]

II. Hellenistic Antecedents. Little need be said under this head. A few illustrations will show that, if episcopus and presbyter can with confidence be traced to

---

[1] It is probably a coincidence without significance (see p. 16) that the leaders in Acts xiii. 1 number five, and perhaps three lay hands on two.

[2] So Strack-Billerbeck, ii. 653. The quotations that follow and justify the summary are ambiguous.

[3] Easton.

[4] Strack-Billerbeck, ii. 658.

Jewish usage, the words were sufficiently familiar in the Greek-speaking world to be readily adopted as titles for officials in the Christian Church.

(a) *Episcopus.* This word is fairly common in Greek literature in the general sense of 'overseer.' It is found in pre-Christian times applied to one of the officials of a temple at Rhodes, in which island we find also a council of five episcopi mentioned.[1] The term is used of the Cynic-Stoic preachers.[2] There is no reason to associate it with finance-officers in particular. It is very rare in inscriptions dealing with club life, in which the treasurer is called anything rather than episcopus ; if we may judge from scanty evidence, it was specially current in Palestine.[3]

(b) *Presbyter.* This word was familiar in Egypt as a technical term for certain village or communal officials ; in Asia Minor it was used for the members of a corporation. The most interesting example is found in an Egyptian papyrus (A.D. 159–60), where five presbyter-priests of the Socnopaeus temple inquire into the conduct of a brother priest.[4]

III. The Acts of the Apostles. To begin a study of the Christian ministry with the Acts is tempting, because the chronological order can thus be preserved ; but on critical principles should not the temptation be resisted ? I propose to do what may seem unscholarly. I see no reason to doubt the general accuracy of the data given in Acts. Those who take a different view point to the apparent discrepancies between Acts and the Pauline Epistles and hold that the latter must undoubtedly be preferred. But there are grave objections to the view that St. Luke has read the customs of later times into the early period. If the Acts is dated about A.D. 80, the development of the ministry as described by St. Luke, in order to have any chance of being accepted, must have corresponded with the impression in the minds of his readers ; and such impression will not have been formed during the years immediately preceding the appearance of Acts. That is to say, during the period 60–70 the Pauline Churches of the West believed the course of events to have been that set forth in Acts. The more we press the divergences between the Epistles and Acts, the more weighty must we suppose the tradition to have been which St. Luke followed in spite of the custom of the Pauline Churches; the Acts account of the ministry must be taken as a genuine reproduction of a primitive tradition. If this line of argument is unconvincing, the development now to be described will seem not actual history, but that view of history which imposed itself on the Church in the course of a generation or so.

---

[1] Moulton-Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament.*

[2] Bauer-Preuschen, *Wörterbuch des N.T.*

[3] Easton quotes Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, pp. 375–9, where three out of the six examples given are from Hauran.

[4] *τῶν ε̄ πρεσβυτέρων ἱερέων . . . συνιερέως* (*B.G.U.* i. 16 ; see Moulton-Milligan).

When our Lord came to Jerusalem for the last time the Church, the community of true Israelites, was already in existence. Jesus was its Head. Its officers were the Twelve, the choosing of whom was in itself a challenge to official Judaism. In the consummated Messianic age they were to 'sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (St. Matt. xix. 28). The break with the synagogue seems to have taken place already; St. Mark vi. 2 is the last reference in the Markan narrative to a visit paid to a synagogue. The Cleansing of the Temple was a break with the sacrificial system in the form it had assumed.

After the Resurrection we find the Christians organised apparently as an order in Judaism, meeting in private houses and in the Temple for prayer—to an outside observer they would have seemed one of the many synagogues formed out of visitors to Jerusalem. Their distinguishing mark was their belief that the Messiah had come in the person of Jesus; that He had been raised from the dead and would before long return and set up His Kingdom on earth. This Kingdom, the heir to the prophetic promises, could have no other centre than Jerusalem—a belief which sufficiently explains the removal of the Galilaeans to the Holy City.

It is often said that the early Christians, expecting as they did a speedy Parousia, would have had no motive to elaborate institutions. But, if the Twelve expected to rule in the Kingdom under Christ, they would naturally choose sub-officers as required, under the eye and according to the will of their unseen Lord, thinking that these would continue their services when the Lord came. In the Pastoral Epistles we find the Church planning permanent institutions for an interim period that might be prolonged, but the motive is essentially the same as that which led to the choice of Matthias or Stephen.

The appointment of Matthias, to make up the symbolic number of twelve, with its primitive accompaniment of casting lots, bears the stamp of genuineness. The remark, ' his episcopate let another take,' is probably due to St. Luke, but there is no reason why it should not have been made at the time.

Soon after the Crucifixion—for the present we shall try to keep on the purely historical plane—an event occurred which affects and complicates our special problem. There was an outbreak of intense religious fervour which swept through the whole community, expressing itself in ecstatic utterances thought to be dictated by God's Holy Spirit, or by the Risen Jesus—the two conceptions blended into one. It was intermittent, and manifested especially in certain persons. In a measure such an endowment was a substitute for appointment by Jesus during His ministry. The conviction was strengthened that the disciples were living in the last days, foretold by Joel and other prophets. This was the origin of the prophetic ministry, the existence of which by the side of the regular ministry creates so many problems.

The new movement attracted adherents among the Greek-speaking Jews, one of whom, Stephen, was destined to realise its latent tendencies and precipitate a break between the Church and Judaism. We are here concerned only with the ordination of him and his six colleagues. Were they the first deacons ? Or were they really presbyters ? Before answering this question we must try to understand the mind of the Apostles. Certain passages of the LXX are so closely parallel to the narrative of Acts vi. that some connection is highly probable.

Numbers xi.	Acts vi.
1. *The people were murmuring evil before the Lord.*	1. *There arose a murmuring of the Grecian Jews.*
[2, 3. Fire consumed many of them.]	[*Cf.* v. 1–11, Judgment on Ananias and Sapphira.]
4. *The mixed multitude that was among them lusted exceedingly.*	Complaint that their widows were neglected.
14. Moses could not bear the burden alone.	2. *The 12 called the multitude of the disciples unto them.*
16. The Lord said : *Take ye men from the elders of Israel, whom thou hast seen to be prophets of the people and their scribes. . . .*[1]	Not fitting that they should serve tables.
17. *I will take of the spirit that is on thee and will put it upon them ; and they shall bear with thee the onslaught of the people, and thou shalt not bear them alone. . . .*	3. *Look ye out . . . from among you 7 men of good report full of the Spirit and of wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business.*
[2. Moses prayed unto the Lord ; *cf.* 11–15.]	4. *But we will continue stedfastly in prayer, and in the ministry of the word.*
24. Moses *collected 70 men from the elders of the people, and set them round about the tent.*	5. *And the saying pleased the whole multitude : and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Spirit. . . .*
25. *The Lord . . . took of the spirit that was upon him and put it upon the 70 men, the elders : and when the spirit rested on them, then they prophesied, but they did so no more* [but gave themselves to the work of administration].	6. *Whom they set before the apostles : and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them.* [*Cf.* Luke x. 1, 70 disciples.]
26–30. The story of Eldad and Medad.	

An equally striking passage is Numbers xxvii. 16 ff. :

'(16) Let the Lord God of the spirits and of all flesh set a man over' (ἐπισκεψάσθω, *cf.* Acts vi. 3, ἐπισκέψασθε) 'this synagogue, (17) who shall go out before them and come in before them' (*i.e.* as a shepherd), 'and lead them out and lead them in, and the synagogue of the Lord shall not be as sheep without a shepherd. (18) And the Lord spake to Moses, saying : Take to thyself Joshua the son of Nun, a man who has spirit in him' (*cf.* Acts vi. 5, 'a man full of faith and of the Holy Spirit'), 'and lay thy hands upon him ; (19) and place him before Eleazar the priest, and give him a charge before all the synagogue, and give a charge concerning him before them ; (20) and thou shalt put of thy glory upon him. . . . (22) And Moses took Joshua and set him before Eleazar the priest and before all the synagogue' (*cf.* Acts vi. 6, 'whom they set before the apostles'), '(23) and he laid his hands upon him'

---

[1] Hebr. *shoteraiw*, used in Ex. v. of Israelite foremen.

(*cf.* Acts, vi. 6 'and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them').

Cf. also Deut. xxxiv. 9, 'Joshua . . . was filled with a spirit of understanding, for Moses had laid his hands upon him' (*cf.* Acts vi. 3, 'full of the Spirit and of wisdom').[1]

Though a certain moulding of details of the tradition to bring it into conformity with the LXX is probable,[2] the simplest and best explanation is that to a certain extent history did repeat itself. A murmuring arose, in connection with food, among those who might seem to the Hebrew-speaking Jews a mixed multitude, and the Twelve seeking guidance in the pages of Scripture found a precedent in Moses' treatment of a similar problem. Scholars disagree as to the nature of the office to which the Seven were appointed. The passages set forth above provide the answer. The Church has always seen in this chapter the origin of the diaconate. 'Serving tables' as distinguished from the ministry of prayer and preaching suggests this. Scholars who reject the traditional view generally say that St. Luke meant to describe the origin of deacons as known in the Church of his day. But Stephen is noteworthy for his preaching; so is Philip, who evangelises Samaria and in xxi. 8 is given the title 'evangelist.' The narrative of Numbers xi. suggests that the Seven were presbyters, and many scholars identify them with the presbyters of Acts xi. 30. But the appointment of seven rulers as overseers with special care of Hellenistic Jews and of charitable relief can hardly be dissociated from the Palestinian institution of *parnaṣim*, which, as we have seen, was probably one of the Jewish antecedents of the episcopus. It seems, then, that characteristics of all three orders of the later ministry were to be found in this primitive undifferentiated ministry. Is not this just what we should expect—the simple preceding the complex? And would not the Twelve, in devising a plan by which the gracious ministrations of Jesus could be continued, be likely to preserve the two elements of His mission on earth, that of shepherd or overseer [1] and that of lowly service? [2] Further, if at this early stage the Twelve contemplated the possibility of not tarrying till the Lord returned, the ordination of Joshua by Moses, clearly reflected in Acts vi., gave them an Old Testament example of a leader providing for a successor to carry on his work while he was still alive.

---

[1] See p. 6. Acts vi. is generally considered good history. The apparent doublets in ii.–v. cease at this point, the occurrence of 'the Twelve,' here only in Acts, suggests that Luke is using a source, and Stephen's speech is acknowledged to be very primitive in character.

[2] For the influence of the O.T. prototype on the later Church, *cf.* the *Sacramentary of Sarapion*, iii. 13 (prayer used at the ordination of presbyters): 'Let a divine Spirit come to be in him that he may be able to be a steward of Thy people and an ambassador of Thy divine oracles, and to reconcile Thy people to Thee the uncreated God, who didst give of the spirit of Moses upon the chosen ones, even holy Spirit. Give a portion of holy Spirit also to this man. . . .'

May we not take a further step and use the narratives of Numbers to illuminate the problem of the prophets?

In what seems to be the Biblical prototype of Acts vi., the Seventy were 'presbyters' and prophets before they were ordained. Similarly Joshua possessed 'spirit' before the spirit that was in Moses was transferred to him. In both cases, then, the main idea is the transference of jurisdiction. The outward manifestation of the spirit in prophesying ceased when the Seventy took up the burden of administration. There was an outburst of prophesying on the part of Eldad and Medad, and some thought that Moses would be displeased, as if the new order had made the old methods irregular. But Moses said: 'Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets'; prophecy still had a part to play. Howbeit, the new ministry was permanent, prophecy intermittent and liable to cease altogether.

This exegesis, of course, refers only to the teaching which the passage would probably have conveyed to the primitive Church at Jerusalem. If it is right, the relation of prophet and ordained minister becomes clear. The work of the prophets was tremendously impressive, but it was precarious. The power of ecstatic utterance which was so large an element in their influence was liable to die down, both in the individual and in the Church as a whole. The prophets were destined to disappear before the regular ministry. Sometimes they passed over to the ranks of the ordained ministry. Their activities in these early days at Jerusalem were under the supervision of the Apostles, and St. Paul, highly as he esteemed them, took care to regulate their ministrations at Corinth. Nevertheless, it seems that they exercised functions in the first two generations of the Church which were afterwards confined to the presbyters; the explanation of what to later minds seems an anomaly being that the Risen Lord was believed to be working in and through them by His Holy Spirit.

---

[1] Even apart from 'I am the good shepherd' of John x. 11 there is good reason to suppose that Jesus held Himself to be the shepherd of God's flock; *cf.* Mark vi. 34; xiv. 27. In Ezek. xxxiv. 12 God Himself intervenes as shepherd in place of His unworthy representatives. Jesus is the Son; the son (*e.g.* David) tends the father's sheep.

[2] Matt. xx. 28; Luke xxii. 27.

The persecution which arose in connection with Stephen's preaching spared the Apostles (viii. 1). This note, which was once thought to betray St. Luke's exaggerated respect for the hierarchy, is now seen to harmonise with the true view of the Hellenistic movement headed by Stephen. Though it faithfully reflected that break with temple and synagogue which seems to be implicit in the final stages of our Lord's ministry, it was for the present in advance of the dominant Christian sentiment. The Jewish resentment discriminated between the main body and the Hellenistic adherents, and Saul probably confined himself to the latter. Philip, one of the Seven, went to Samaria, where he preached and baptized. Peter and John, in the name of the Twelve, came to supervise the work. The special presence and gift of the Holy Spirit, which at this stage of Church development seems to have been generally accompanied and manifested by ecstatic utterance, was now vouchsafed to the new converts, by the laying on of the Apostles' hands: To develop this is outside our subject [1]; it is sufficient to say that ordination seems to have been a specialised form, conveying jurisdiction, of that authoritative transference of the Spirit from those who possessed the gift to those as yet without it which at this period, if we accept the evidence of Acts, was the recognised method of initiation into the full blessings of the Messianic community.

In Acts ix. 17, Ananias' laying of hands upon Saul is apparently for the purpose of healing ; in any case it has nothing to do with ordination. Chapter xi. 19–30 describes the coming of Christianity to Antioch, thanks to spontaneous expansion following on the persecution. Barnabas is sent as an envoy of the Jerusalem Church, and though he is not here called an apostle he is clearly one in the secondary sense ; he is an official teacher (*v.* 23), and would doubtless have been called a prophet too (' full of the Holy Ghost,' *cf.* xiii. 1). Further visits of prophets are mentioned in *v.* 27, and in *v.* 30 Barnabas and Saul go to Jerusalem with a money contribution, which they hand over to ' the presbyters.' [1] By xii. 17 James is occupying a position of authority which in xv. is no less a one than president of the Apostolic Council at which Peter is the chief speaker. In the Council and its decrees the presbyters are associated with the Apostles (xv. 6, 22, 23 ; *cf.* xvi. 4). In xv. 4 the two orders are distinguished from the Church as a whole.

---

[1] See my Essay, 'The Laying on of Hands in the N.T.,' in *Confirmation*, vol. i. (S.P.C.K.).

Without undue rashness it is possible to reconstruct the development that had taken place in the Mother Church. The need of help to bear the burden of responsibility, which had been satisfied, for a brief while and so far as the Hellenistic section went, by the ordination of the Seven, would soon be felt more strongly than ever.[2] Especially, in view of the Apostles' missionary journeys, a permanent head was required for the Jerusalem Church. Probably James, ' the brother of the Lord,' naturally assumed the position, prestige and force of character making him the inevitable man.[3] If it would be an anachronism to term him a diocesan bishop, he was clearly the episcopus *par excellence* of the local Church. It is open to anyone to hold that the Apostles ordained him, but it is far more natural to suppose that he ranked by the side of the Twelve (like St. Paul) in virtue of the appearance of the Risen Lord to him, thus receiving his apostleship ‘ not from men, neither through man.’

---

[1] Note that the presbyters receive money, a function in some theories of the ministry associated with episcopi and deacons.

[2] There may have been presbyters for the Hebrew-speaking section before chap. vi.

[3] Probably also age. The followers of Jesus during the Ministry were engaged in a ' youth-movement.' It is unlikely that Jesus called men older than Himself, in view of the long lives of the leading Apostles. If James was the eldest son of Joseph by a former wife, his age as well as his relation to Jesus would give him a prominent position.

The Gentile Mission begins in earnest in Acts xiii. A group of ‘ prophets and teachers ’[1]—Barnabas, Symeon, Lucius, Manaen and Saul—are ‘ ministering to the Lord,’ leading public worship, when, presumably through the utterance of one of their number, the Holy Ghost said : ‘ Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.’ The others, after fasting and prayer, laid their hands on the two and ‘ dismissed ’ them. If this is really an ordination service, it might seem as if either Symeon, Lucius and Manaen—or at least one of them—must have been in ‘ episcopal orders,’ or else that the theory of Apostolical Succession must be severely shaken. Now it is quite likely that one or other of the three had been set apart for what in our discussion of Acts vi. we have called the undifferentiated ministry. By this time there were presbyters at Jerusalem, and there were presently to be presbyters at Lystra and neighbouring cities. In view of the fact that the Churches of Eastern Asia Minor derived from Antioch, and Antioch in its turn from Jerusalem, which supervised it closely (xi. 22, 27 ; *cf.* Gal. ii. 11), it may be supposed that Antioch at this time had presbyters. Since presbyters and episcopi had not so far been differentiated, conceivably members of this one order might have ordained Barnabas and Saul. But, solemn as the occasion was, it is almost impossible to treat it as an ordination. Barnabas, who had been sent as an envoy—an apostolic man if not an apostle—from Jerusalem, could hardly require any further authorisation. And St. Paul’s vehement disclaimer of having received his apostolate from men seems to exclude his ordination at Antioch. It is best, therefore, to regard the laying on of hands (by unspecified persons) as a solemn setting apart for new work for which the Church of Antioch felt a special responsibility, a dismissal of missionaries as we should say.

On the homeward journey of their first great missionary tour, Paul and Barnabas appointed presbyters in every Church, with prayer and fasting. The word used, in this context, implies a solemn setting apart and investing with authority.[1] The remaining passage of importance in Acts is xx. 17, 28. St. Paul at Miletus 'sent to Ephesus, and called to him the presbyters of the Church.' In the speech which follows he says: 'Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you episcopi, to feed (or rather, shepherd) the church of God.' We have already discussed the Old Testament associations of this passage. Clearly the presbyters are episcopi and the episcopi are presbyters; it is unconvincing to urge that some only of the presbyters are addressed at this point. In view of the LXX colouring we may suppose that episcopi is here used of function rather than of office; the local ministers, called presbyters by St. Luke here as elsewhere in Acts, are called overseers or shepherds after their most characteristic function. But perhaps St. Luke is faithfully reproducing the word used by St. Paul in the Gentile Churches, as in Phil. i. 1. When the Apostle reaches Jerusalem for the last time, he goes in to James, 'all the presbyters' being present as assessors (xxi. 18). The Twelve have apparently all left Jerusalem, and the distinguished visitor is received, as we should say, by the bishop of the diocese in a synod of his clergy. Philip, one of the Seven, is now living at Caesarea. He is known as 'the evangelist,' and has four daughters who possess the prophetic gift.

---

[1] Presumably all prophets would be teachers, not all teachers prophets.

St. Luke's theory of Church Order may be summarised thus. Over against the high priest or priests and the presbyters (xxiv. 1; iv. 23; xxiii. 14; xxv. 15) were set, in a kind of Christian Sanhedrin at Jerusalem, the Apostles and the presbyters (xv. 2, 4, 6, 22; xvi. 4), or James and the presbyters (xxi. 18). Prophecy and speaking with tongues were also marked features of Church life. The Mother

---

[1] *Χειροτονήσαντες αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους κατ' ἐκκλησίαν* (Acts xiv. 23). *Χειροτονεῖν* originally referred to popular election by show of hands, and then came to mean simply 'choose,' as in 2 Cor. viii. 19. But when it is used of the action of two religious leaders on behalf of their converts, it most naturally refers to ordination like that described in Acts vi. *Cf.* Philo, *de praem. et poen.* 417 M., *βασιλεὺς . . . ὑπὸ θεοῦ χειροτονηθείς*; Jos. *Ant.* VI. xiii. 9, *τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κεχειροτονημένον βασιλέα*, in which *χειρ.* is used of choice by a superior.

Church sent delegates, apostolic men and prophets, to supervise the Church of Antioch (xi. 22, 27), which at one period was led by a group of five men—apostles,[1] prophets and teachers. Paul and Barnabas were commissioned for their missionary journey by the Church of Antioch, the Churches founded by them or by Paul alone being subject to the supervision of the founder (xvi. 4; xx. 17). Of 'Independency,' of an isolated congregation represented as a self-governing republic, there is no trace. The picture thus drawn by St. Luke presents no intrinsic improbabilities; just along these lines should we have expected Christian leaders of Jewish birth to act.

IV. The Pauline Epistles. In St. Paul's Epistles we are on firm historical ground, such as not all scholars recognise in the Acts. References to the Christian ministry are incidental and therefore often ambiguous. Tempting as it is to interpret them in the light of the Acts, and to assume that the Apostle appointed presbyters in every city where there was a Christian community, we must at this stage study the Epistles by themselves.

The plenary powers of St. Paul, as founder and superintending missionary,[2] are sufficiently illustrated by 1 Cor. iv. 17: 'Timothy . . . shall put you in remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, even as I teach everywhere in every church'; vii. 17: 'So ordain I in all the churches'; xiv. 37: 'The things which I write unto you . . . they are the commandments of the Lord.' Yet he had to plead perpetually with the Corinthians and to justify himself, now urging, now refraining from pressing, his apostolic rights. If the Church of Corinth was an autonomous democratic community, the results were not encouraging.

Under the Apostle were subordinate missionaries, who often acted as delegates, armed with his authority, expressed as often as not in letters; such were Timothy, Epaphroditus and Tychicus. St. Paul and his helpers stood for the authority of the Church at large, which at this stage of development was explicit in persons.

---

[1] See below, p. 37.

[2] 1 Cor. ix. 5 shows that the missionary journeys of apostles, in a wide sense of the term, were familiar to the Corinthians, who would doubtless assume that their authority over distant Churches resembled Paul's authority over the Corinthians.

Within the local Church the distinction between teacher and taught, ruler and ruled, is clear. See, for example, 1 Thess. v. 12 : 'Know them that labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you' ; and Gal. vi. 6 : 'Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things.' So, before studying the Epistles separately, we see abundant evidence of the double ministry, universal and local, about to be discussed.

(a) *Philippians*, *1 Thessalonians*, *1 Corinthians*, *Romans*. We take these Epistles first, in the chronological order of St. Paul's relations with the Churches addressed ; all four are of undoubted authenticity.

Philippians begins with the address 'to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the episcopi and deacons.' These are taken to be the two main orders of the local ministry, presbyters and deacons ; or else to denote function rather than office, those that have the oversight and those that minister. In the latter case they are the two divisions, ruling and serving, of the presbyters appointed by St. Paul in every city. Perhaps function had not yet developed into clearly differentiated office in the later sense, but had gone far on its way to do so.

This is a convenient place to mention the order of deacons, which only incidentally concerns us. In many passages of the New Testament the word *diaconus* and its cognates denote humble Christian ministries rendered to the Church. If Acts vi. is regarded as ambiguous, only in Philippians and 1 Tim. iii. 8–13 is there clear evidence of the existence of a class of men called deacons, and even the Philippians passage is doubted. On the other hand, so developed a list of qualifications as that given in 1 Tim. implies years of previous history, and no doubt men called deacons existed in the Greek-speaking Church from the first. Their origin as a separate grade of the ministry was probably by differentiation from an originally undifferentiated ministry.[1] If presbyters were appointed at Philippi, as at Lystra and elsewhere, some would naturally possess qualifications for leadership, others for service not involving responsibility. Difference in social status may have been taken into account ; a slave, for example, marked out by spiritual gifts for office, would, we may imagine, have become a deacon rather than an episcopus. But the services rendered by willing helpers, especially by young men as opposed to presbyters, whose name by derivation implies at least middle age, may have led to the development of a formal office to regularise their functions ; in this case ' the young men ' of Acts v. 6, 10 are a first hint of the deacons. On the whole, the description of the deacons in 1 Tim. iii., where they are grave fathers of families, their association with episcopi in Philippians, and their very important position in the third century, make this explanation less probable.

---

[1] See p. 12.

1 Thessalonians. The only reference to the ministry is in v. 12 : ' We beseech you, brethren, to know them that labour among you, and are over you (τοὺς . . . προϊσταμένους ὑμῶν) in the Lord.' The command in v. 20, ' despise not prophesyings,' suggests that prophecy was unequally developed in the various Churches and not everywhere held in honour.

1 Corinthians. This letter, though so largely concerned with discipline, gives no clear indication as to the local ministry of the Church at Corinth. The outstanding passage is xii. 28 : ' God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, then miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, divers kind of tongues.' It is impossible here to discuss this very difficult passage, but some conclusions seem clear. The description is in general terms, of the Church at large rather than of Corinth. The first three classes form a group by themselves. Helps and governments suggest functions similar to those of the deacons and episcopi of Phil. i. 1, but it is improbable that a duly appointed local ministry would have been referred to in these terms. ' Prophets,' in such a place of honour, must denote a clearly recognised rank in the Church at large ; it cannot refer to the gift of prophecy seemingly possessed by most of the Corinthian Christians

(xiv. 31 : ‘ Ye all can prophesy ’). If these conclusions are right, then St. Paul is referring first to the recognised [1] hierarchy of the universal Church—missionaries in chief and other authoritative bearers of the tradition, whether possessing or lacking the prophetic gift—and then adding a number of functions performed by classes of Christians, the choice being dictated by what was familiar to his readers. The passage, then, tells us nothing about a local ministry. Was there one at all, in the later sense of the word ministry ? Or, to bring the difficulty to a head, who celebrated the Eucharist at Corinth after St. Paul's departure ? If we answer this question without reference to Christian tradition, we shall reply : One of the prophets who appear in chapter xiv. as leading the worship. Nor shall we suppose that such a prophet was necessarily also an episcopus or presbyter. Indeed in 1 and 2 Cor. there is no trace of any ruling and teaching class such as we find in other Epistles.[2] Did St. Paul for once change his methods and, instead of appointing presbyters after the Jewish fashion, in this typically Greek city try an experiment of pure democracy, checked when necessary by the resumption of his own plenary powers, thus becoming ‘ to them that are without law, as without law . . . that I might gain them that are without law ’ ? [3] The prophetic gift which, with qualifications, he prized so highly [4] and which was so widely diffused among the Corinthians may have disposed him to dispense with a regularised local ministry. Or, an explanation more likely to appeal to the modern missionary, there were no suitable candidates for the ministry. The moral antecedents of some of the converts were exceptionally bad [5] and at best the available men were novices.[6]

Romans. The Apostle's references to the ministry are couched in general terms. He speaks [7] of prophecy, ministry (διακονία), he that teacheth, he that ruleth (ὁ προϊστάμενος).[1] Perhaps he refrained from further definition in a case where he had no first-hand knowledge. But the words used suggest a ministry in which prophets and teachers, as also episcopi (presbyters) and deacons, found a place; who appointed them, or whether they formed regular orders, it is profitless to guess.

---

[1] Or perhaps ‘ traditional ’ would be better ; see p. 37.

[2] Gal. vi. 6 ; Phil. i. 1 ; 1 Thess. v. 12.

[3] 1 Cor. ix. 21. Relations between the Apostle and the local Jewish community were exceptionally strained ; see Acts xviii.

[4] 1 Cor. xiv. 39–40.

[5] *Cf.* vi. 11 : ‘ Such were some of you.’

[6] *Cf.* 1 Tim. iii. 6. Did St. Paul appoint presbyters when he came to set things in order (1 Cor. xi. 34) ?

[7] Rom. xii. 7, 8.

(b) *Ephesians* is best treated separately, because it is not universally accepted as by St. Paul, though it is indubitably Pauline, and in any case it represents a rather later stage of development than 1 Cor. Being in essence a Catholic Epistle it is exceptionally valuable as summing up the state of things in the Church when it was written. 'He gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers' (iv. 11). That evangelists in the first triad have taken the places of the teachers of 1 Cor. is readily intelligible. Evangelists may be taken to be missionaries who have neither apostolic authority nor the prophetic gift. They bring the message of the Gospel in the name of the universal Church, as Philip brought it to Samaria. At an earlier stage their chief function was to impart the authentic tradition,[2] but in a properly established Church this was firmly held and could be taught by the local officers. These are known as 'pastors (ποιμένες) and teachers,' men whose function was to tend the flock and teach the faith. The resemblance to Acts xx. 28 ff. is remarkable. No other classes of ministry are mentioned and the shepherds or pastors [3] are clearly the episcopi discussed above. The clear-cut definition which here follows the first three titles is strikingly different from the vague words which occupy the same position in the parallel passage of 1 Cor.

Earlier in the Epistle we read of the Church as 'built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets' (ii. 20), and of the 'holy apostles and prophets' (iii. 5). The very phrase that (suspiciously to some scholars, who see in it a sign of late date) looks back to 'Holy Apostles' as founders of the Church associates prophets with them.

---

[1] The word also occurs in 1 Thess. v. 12, where R.V. translates 'them . . . that are over you.' There is no evidence to justify any conclusion as to the functions of the men thus described.

[2] *Cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 23; xv. 2.

[3] The word is used only in Eph. iv. 11 in the N.T. of officials of the Church.

(c) *The Pastoral Epistles.* When we come to these Epistles we are conscious of a change of atmosphere. The great need of the Church is now discipline and sound teaching, which can be assured only by a regularised ministry in each local Church, appointed by and responsible to apostolic men representing the Church at large, in whom is vested the authority formerly belonging to the founder. The Pastorals show us St. Paul at the close of his life making provision for the continuance of sound Church ways after his guiding influence is removed ; or else they represent the dominant tendency in the Church sometime about the year 80, a tendency that was so confidently held to be according to the mind of St. Paul that regulations embodying it were conflated with genuine surviving letters of his. They cannot be due to a movement which made fraudulent use of the Apostle's name to promote a new view of the ministry ; we may be sure that the Church would have at once rejected such an innovation.

Timothy's ordination is referred to in 1 Tim. iv. 14 : 'Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery' ; and in i. 18 : 'According to the prophecies which led the way to thee.' See also 2 Tim. i. 6 : 'the gift of God, which is in thee through the laying on of my hands.' If we interpret the first passage in the light of the second, the prophets uttered the solemn words which declared Timothy chosen by God for the ministry. Paul was the ordainer, presbyters assisting at the laying on of hands.[1]

The apparent use of two words, episcopus and presbyter, to denote the same office is generally thought to persist in the Pastorals. Thus in Tit. i. 5–7 : 'appoint presbyters in every city . . . if any man is blameless,' is followed by 'the episcopus must be blameless.' But it is improbable that two words are used interchangeably of precisely the same people. It is significant that the word episcopus, plural in Acts xx. 28 and Phil. i. 1, is singular in 1 Tim. iii. 2,

---

[1] *Cf.* the Jewish custom, p. 7.

Tit. i. 7, while presbyter is plural in Tit. i. 5.[1] There is nothing in the New Testament to suggest that a single presbyter would ever have been appointed to guide the Church of a city. On the other hand, the use of the singular ‘episcopus’ will seem to some a hint that the task of overseership, for which the episcopi had been collectively responsible, was beginning to be entrusted to one man. There is, however, nothing to make us suppose an elevation of the episcopus at the expense of the presbyters. Rather the saying of 1 Tim. iii. 1: ‘If a man seeketh the office of an episcopus, he desireth a good work,’ quoted as a kind of catchword, suggests an elevation at the expense of the prophets; the permanent ordained ministry, which had been lightly esteemed as compared with prophecy, was coming to its own. Presbyters who teach diligently deserve special honour (1 Tim. v. 17). This falls into line with Eph. iv. 11, where ‘teachers,’ who in 1 Cor. occupy the third place in the non-local hierarchy, form an order of the local ministry called ‘pastors and teachers.’

Titus is commanded to appoint presbyters in every city (Tit. i. 5); Timothy to ‘lay hands suddenly on no man’ (1 Tim. v. 22), which in view of the many references to the ministry in these Epistles and of Timothy's own ordination by laying on of hands, mentioned in iv. 14, is best taken of ordination.[2]

V. Other New Testament Writings.—(a) *Hebrews.* This seems to have been written from a place outside Italy, perhaps to a group at Rome.[3] The recipients are bidden to ‘obey them that have the rule over you, and submit to them; for they watch in behalf of your souls, as they that shall give account’ (xiii. 17). The idea is exactly that of Ezek. xxxiii., xxxiv. and Acts xx.; the ministers are watchmen, shepherds, episcopi.[4]

---

[1] There is no special significance in the plural of 1 Tim. v. 17; the singular of v. 19 is natural in the context; v. 1 refers to any older man.

[2] Rather than of reconciliation of penitents; confirmation is most unlikely.

[3] See xiii. 24, ‘The Italians salute you,’ *i.e.* your fellow-citizens with the writer. The use of the epistle in 1 Clement suggests that Rome was its destination; v. 12 and other passages suggest that a group within the Church rather than the whole Church is addressed.

[4] The shepherd was responsible for losses; *cf.* Gen. xxxi. 39.

(b) *James.* 'Is any among you sick? Let him call for the presbyters of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord' (v. 14). A sick man would not ask for elderly men as such, so presbyters are meant. If the Epistle was written by James the Lord's brother, we conclude that the gifts of healing, which according to 1 Cor. xii. 30 resided in certain spirit-filled men, were in the Palestinian Church normally exercised by ordained ministers. If the Epistle is later, a product of the second generation of the Gentile Church, then we may see in this passage an example of the tendency we saw in the Pastorals to gather all ministrations into the hands of ordained men.

(c) *1 Peter.* Jesus Christ is the head Shepherd of the Christian flock (v. 4), 'the Shepherd and Bishop' of souls (ii. 25). The article covers both words, as in Eph. iv. 11, 'shepherds and teachers.' The writer, a fellow-presbyter, in v. 1 addresses the presbyters among those to whom he writes. They are to tend God's flock, 'acting as episcopi (ἐπισκοποῦντες), not of constraint.'[1] Once more we are wholly within the circle of ideas found in Ezekiel and Acts xx.

(d) *2 and 3 John.* To discuss the exact force of the phrase 'the elder' would carry us far into the intricacies of Johannine controversy. We may take it to mean 'the presbyter,' a Church officer of standing who could be recognised under this designation—when one of the episcopi-presbyters holds this position he is virtually a bishop; or, more naturally, of a churchman of outstanding importance by virtue of his age and prestige, whose office is not specified. Diotrephes, 'who loveth to have the preeminence' (3 John 9), is a bishop; we can now use the word confidently. He is responsible for deciding whether a pastoral letter shall be read to the Church, and so for the conduct of worship; he is responsible also for the relations with other Churches and has the power of excommunication. The writer of the Epistles presumably has a *status* not inferior to that of Diotrephes.[2]

---

[1] *Cf.* 1 Tim. iii. 1, which suggests an unwillingness to act as episcopus.

[2] Streeter suggests that he is bishop of Ephesus and stands to Diotrephes as Metropolitan to Suffragan (*The Primitive Church*, p. 88).

(e) *The Revelation.* The scene of the worship described in this book is laid in heaven, but probably the description is based on the worship of earth. The writer is a prophet (xxii. 6, 10) and perhaps looks upon the presbyters as a body to which he does not himself belong. The twenty-four presbyters (iv. 4, etc.) on their seats in a semi-circle, with the central throne in the midst, suggest that the later position of the president and presbyters at the Liturgy goes back to first-century practice.[1]

VI. Post-Canonical Writings.—(a) *The Didache* ('Teaching of the Twelve Apostles'). This is generally taken to be a Syrian document composed about the year 100. It is exceptionally valuable as showing the transition from a missionary stage, in which Churches are dependent on the ministrations of visiting officials, to one of spiritual self-support. The Christians addressed are accustomed to receive apostles and prophets.[2] But these wandering Church officers are not above suspicion. Rules are laid down by which genuine men may be distinguished from false men. Especially must a prophet who uses his power of exalted speech to further his own interests be rejected. 'Every true prophet desiring to settle among you is worthy of his food' is a sentence which suggests how in some places the rule of a single man may have arisen. 'Permit the prophets to offer thanksgiving (*i.e.* offer the Eucharistic prayer[3]) as much as they desire' shows us the prophets fulfilling functions which are generally thought to be confined to the ordained ministry. But a local ministry is required. 'Appoint for yourselves (*χειροτονήσατε*) episcopi and deacons worthy of the Lord . . . for they also minister to you the ministry of the prophets and teachers. Therefore do not despise them, for they are your honourable men together with the prophets and teachers.'[4] It is quite clear, then, that apostles (missionaries), prophets and teachers still existed as a kind of ministry representing the Church at large, as we have seen them in 1 Cor. xii., though they have largely lost their prestige. A local ministry, of the type possessed by the Philippians in St. Paul's lifetime, is being introduced. Undeniably a backward Church! It is useless to ask whether the visiting prophets were ordained, or who, if any one, ordained the episcopi and deacons 'appointed' by the Church.[1] Our document is silent on this point.

---

[1] This concludes our survey of the N.T., in which for the sake of brevity much has been omitted. Thus many passages in the Fourth Gospel in my opinion presuppose the Christian ministry, but I cannot develop this thought here.

[2] xi. 3, *τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν*, suggests that there is no clear dividing line between the two.

[3] Some interpret otherwise.

[4] x. 7–xv. 2.

Our perplexity is somewhat enlightened when we ask ourselves who wrote this manual and who received it. Whoever wrote it exercised a measure of authority and represented the Great Church; it is an attractive hypothesis that the Church of Antioch was responsible.[2] The language used is that of command, not good advice. The 'Didache' is a manual apparently intended not for a single community, in which case it would be in epistolary form, but for a number of Churches. Every community, however primitive its development, would have some responsible persons to whom a communication would be addressed. It is probable, then, that the 'Didache' was sent to the presbyters of the local Churches, councils of seniors to whom the commands are addressed.[3] It is difficult to imagine the missionary founders of the Churches in question not appointing some local officers. If I am right in this suggestion, the situation presupposed can be reconstructed from 1 Tim. v. 17: 'Let the presbyters that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially those who labour in the word and in teaching.' There were three kinds of presbyters—those that were slothful in ruling,[4] those that did their best but had no aptitude for preaching and teaching, and those that both ruled and taught in a satisfactory manner. The presbyters in the country districts of Syria may well have belonged to the first class, not energetic themselves, and needing outside pressure before they were ready to appoint others to do the necessary work. If a group of Churches is addressed, the ‘ bishops ’ referred to may be one for each community.[1] If more than one for a single community are meant, then the presbyters are commanded to appoint men, whether from among their own number or not, who will undertake the greatly needed work of shepherding.

---

[1] If the Jewish 'Two Ways' was part of the original document, one would be inclined to think that the (originally) Jewish custom of laying on of hands was practised.

[2] See Streeter, *The Primitive Church*, pp. 144 ff.

[3] The regulations about baptism and 'the baptiser' in vii., which precede all mention of the Eucharist and the ministry, would most naturally be carried out by the presbyters.

[4] *Cf.* Rom. xii. 8, 'He that ruleth, with diligence.' Some of the local officers first appointed by the 'apostles' may have proved unsuitable.

(b) *The Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians.* It is unfortunate for our purpose that a document largely concerned with questions of the ministry is so ambiguous that no finality of interpretation seems possible. The letter was written, probably in 96, in the name of the Church of Rome, to the Church of Corinth. While suasion is the dominant note, authority is in the background. A Church could not be a law unto itself ; it was responsible to the whole Church. Rome as the Church of the capital, the scene of the martyrdom of SS. Peter and Paul, was marked out as the proper body to administer fatherly admonition. The epistle is often taken as a first example of the Petrine claims of the Roman see, but St. Paul plays a larger part in the appeal than St. Peter,[2] and 1 Cor. is specially recalled. Is it not more natural to suppose that the Roman Church was mainly actuated by a feeling that it was the legatee of the responsibility once borne by the *founder* of the Church of Corinth ? [3]

The Corinthian Church had formerly obeyed its rulers (τοῖς ἡγουμένοις).[4] At the instigation of a few [5] malcontents, it had been disloyal to the presbyters.[6] The Corinthians should rather be at ‘ peace with the presbyters set over ’ it and ‘ submit to the presbyters.’ [1] This admonition is backed by an appeal to the well-known facts regarding the apostolic origin of the ministry. ‘ Christ is from God and the Apostles from Christ. . . . They preached from district to district, and from city to city, and they appointed their first converts, testing them by the Spirit, to be episcopi and deacons of the future believers.[2] And this was no new method, for many years before had episcopi and deacons been written of ; for the Scripture says thus in one place : “ I will establish their episcopi in righteousness, and their deacons in faith.” ’ [3] The theory of the ministry closely resembles that presupposed by the Acts and the Pastorals. Note the reference to the Spirit in ordination, suggesting that the prophets played a part as in I Tim. ; also the basing of the two orders on Old Testament precedent, as in Acts vi. according to our hypothesis.

---

[1] I do not press this point. But if the *Didache* emanated from Antioch about 100, the appointment of a real *bishop* would harmonise with the Syrian movement towards mon-episcopacy pre-supposed by the Ignatian Epistles. In any case the difficulty of reconciling a Syrian *provenance* of the *Didache, c.* 100, with the facts of the Ignatian Epistles is acute. If this suggestion is rejected, the date of the *Didache* must be taken back to *c.* 80. This gives nearly fifty years for the Churches addressed to reach their existing state of development.

[2] See v., xlvii.

[3] The memory of the Captivity Epistles, written from Rome according to the received view, in the greetings of which the Apostle associated members of the local Church with himself, may have contributed to form this feeling.

[4] i. 3 ; *cf.* xxi. 6, ‘ let us respect those who rule over us ’ (τοὺς προηγουμένους ἡμῶν).

[5] i. 1 ; xlvii. 6.

[6] xlvii. 6. The word used is στασιάζειν, make a στάσις such as is so familiar in the history of Greek cities.

Clement proceeds [4] : ‘ Our Apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife for the title of episcopus. For this cause, therefore, since they had received perfect fore-knowledge, they appointed those who have been already mentioned, and afterwards added the codicil [5] that, if they should fall asleep, other approved men (*δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες*) should succeed to their ministry. We consider, therefore, that it is not just to remove from their ministry those who were appointed by them, or later by other eminent men (*ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν*), with the consent of the whole Church, and have ministered to the flock of Christ without blame. . . . For our sin is not small, if we eject from the episcopate those who have blamelessly and holily offered its gifts. Blessed are those presbyters [6] who have finished their course before now. . . .’

Two problems arise : Are episcopi and presbyters two words for the same thing ? Who are the ‘ eminent men ’ ?

---

[1] liv. 2 ; lvii. I.

[2] *τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν*. The phrase suggests that the differentiation of orders was in advance of existing requirements.

[3] xlii. 2–5.

[4] xliv. I–5.

[5] I give Lake’s translation.

[6] The word is perhaps used in the sense of Heb. xi. 2, ‘ fathers,’ ‘ elders,’ *i.e.* the leaders of a past generation.

The identity of the episcopi[1] and the presbyters[2] is generally asserted. But no satisfactory answer is given to the query why different words should be used to convey the same meaning. Without claiming that two separate orders, of episcopi and presbyters, existed—there is no evidence for this—it is possible to visualise a situation in which there was a place for both. We begin with St. Paul's appointment of presbyters, a council of men of standing. Twenty or thirty years pass. Some are dead, and vacancies have been filled ; some have lost their first fervour ; others have been proved to possess no force of character and are *fainéants* ; others again are now too old to be of account. But, whether satisfactory or not, no one dreams of disputing the position of the men appointed by St. Paul. Meanwhile the Church has grown and new needs have developed. To meet these needs men with administrative power and gifts of leadership have been appointed, normally chosen from the ranks of the presbyters. To them (helped by the deacons) has fallen the task of correspondence, of charitable relief, and above all of receiving and offering the gifts at the Eucharist. Discontent, which affects the presbyters in a measure, comes to a head in criticism of the real rulers of the Church, the episcopi.

We turn now to our second question. Dr. Streeter sees only special pleading in the arguments of those who are unable to identify the ' approved men ' and the ' eminent men ' of chapter xliv.[3] Once more I ask why Clement should have employed elegant variation. The structure of the sentences seems to me to show that the ' eminent men ' have a status surpassing that of the local ministry. The Apostles (*a*) appoint as ministers[4] in the Church ' those who have been already mentioned ' ; (*b*) provide for other (ἕτεροι) approved men to succeed them : both (*a*) and (*b*) refer to the local ministry. The local ministry is appointed by (*a*) the Apostles, (*b*) other (ἑτέρων) eminent men ; the agents in both (*a*) and (*b*) seem to belong to the Church at large. ' Eminent men ' may, therefore, be legitimately taken to mean 'apostles' in the wider sense, apostolic men, or possibly prophets of the universal Church. The position of Timothy and Titus after the death of St. Paul was precisely that of Clement's 'eminent men.'

---

[1] xlii. ; xliv.

[2] xlvii. ; liv. ; lvii.

[3] *The Primitive Church*, p. 217.

[4] See p. 29 on bishops and deacons for ' future believers.'

If the above argument holds good, the position at Corinth in the last decade of the first century was as follows. All episcopi were presbyters, not all presbyters were episcopi. The episcopi ejected by the malcontents owed their appointment to officers with a super-local status. It is conceivable that the episcopi presided each over one group of Christians, whether in a 'house-church' or in a suburb like Cenchreae, and that the episcopus who presided over the group which the others joined at the Sunday Eucharist had gone far on the way to becoming a bishop in the full meaning of the term. Though Apostolical Succession in a sense is presupposed by Clement, there is no mention of ordination or laying on of hands. In view of the resemblance to the Pastorals otherwise in what concerns the ministry, some will think that ordination was too familiar to the readers to need mentioning. The revolt may have been due to the claims of the prophets. Whatever conclusions are drawn as regards Corinth may reasonably be considered to hold good for Rome.[1]

(c) '*The Shepherd*' *of Hermas*. Internal evidence fixes at least the Vision in the time of Clement, that is in the last decade of the first century, for Hermas is told in a vision: 'Thou shalt write two little books, and shalt send one to Clement. . . . So Clement shall send to the foreign cities, for this is his duty. . . . Together with the presbyters that preside over the church thou shalt read the book to this city.'[2] The date is confirmed by the general agreement of Clement and Hermas as regards the stage of development reached by the ministry. The external evidence of the Muratorian Canon (*c.* 200) puts 'The Shepherd' in the episcopate of Pius (140–155). If the later date is accepted, it may fairly be urged that Hermas is deliberately writing of the state of things supposed to have existed forty or fifty years earlier. Dr. Streeter's arguments for the earlier date[1] are weighty and their result is assumed here. As to the importance to be attached to the list of early bishops of Rome we cannot do better than adopt Dr. Lawlor's judicious summing up : 'Whatever authority the bishops from Clement to Pius may have had, we seem to have sufficient ground for the belief that they followed one another as leaders of the Church in some sort of regular succession, and that their several periods of activity are dated with reasonable exactness.'[2]

---

[1] I have omitted the 'rulers' of i. 3, xxi. 6 from the discussion, because in both passages πρεσβύτεροι, who are mentioned after 'rulers,' are contrasted with young men, and may mean merely old men; in which case there is nothing to show whether 'rulers' refers to episcopi or to presbyters. But if πρεσβύτεροι means presbyters, rulers will be episcopi; hardly, I think, 'eminent men' of the super-local ministry.

[2] *Vis.* ii. 4.

Hermas is a prophet and looks at the official ministry from the outside. The stones of the building in his Vision 'are the apostles and bishops and teachers and deacons . . . who exercised their office of bishop and teacher and deacon . . . some of them already fallen asleep, and others still living.'[3] These four classes take the place of the apostles and prophets of Eph. ii. 20. Those 'who preached to the whole world' are called 'apostles and teachers.'[4] We have already seen that Clement is the head of the presbyters, charged with the duty of communicating with other Churches.[5] Episcopi are described as 'hospitable persons' who have 'sheltered the needy and the widows.'[6] We also hear of 'rulers of the Church (προηγούμενοι) and the occupants of the chief seats,'[7] and of quarrels about the first place.[8] Bearing in mind the episcopal lists and the probable date of 'The Shepherd,' we conclude that in Rome about 100 there were presbyters and deacons ; also episcopi, presumably those of the presbyters who were entrusted with active administration ; and that one of the presbyter-episcopi, Clement, represented the Church in its dealings with other Churches, and so, whatever his technical degree of authority, appeared to the outside world as the leader of the Church. The general picture closely resembles that derived from the

---

[1] See *The Primitive Church*, pp. 203 ff.

[2] Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* (Lawlor and Oulton), ii. 45.

[3] *Vis.* iii. 5.

[4] *Sim.* ix. 25.

[5] *Vis.* ii. 4.

[6] *Sim.* ix. 27.

[7] *Vis.* iii. 9 ; *cf.* ii. 2.

[8] *Sim.* viii. 7.

Epistle of Clement. If we hold the late date of Hermas and reject the suggestion that he is deliberately reproducing the conditions of an earlier time, then we shall conclude that the monarchical episcopate was not fully developed at Rome for another half century, though the presiding episcopus was gradually becoming a bishop in fact, if not in theory.

(d) *The Epistles of Ignatius.* Euodius was the first bishop of Antioch.[1] He was succeeded by Ignatius, who wrote a series of letters about the year 110, on his way to martyrdom at Rome, in which the three-fold ministry appears unambiguously. He speaks of himself as 'the bishop of Syria,' a phrase which suggests that the metropolitan was prior to the local bishop.[2] He addresses the Churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Philadelphia, and Smyrna, in each case referring to the bishop. He also writes to Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna. The Churches of Asia Minor and those of Syria are all organised on the same lines, with a threefold ministry of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Without these 'there is not even the name of a Church.' [3] The Eucharist is only valid when celebrated under the bishop or his delegate ; nor is baptism lawful without his approval.[4] The distinction between the *ecclesia docens* and the *ecclesia discens* could hardly be expressed in stronger terms ; but the emphasis is on the need of obeying the bishop, with the presbyters and deacons, not on the bishop's powers as contrasted with those of the other orders. The danger of heresy causes Ignatius to speak thus strongly. He says nothing about the apostolic institution of episcopacy, or about ordination and the laying on of hands. It is often said that the vehemence of his language shows that monarchical episcopacy was a recent introduction, by no means securely rooted, but the inference is not necessary.

It is not certain from Ignatius that the monarchical episcopate existed farther west than Asia Minor. When he speaks of 'the episcopi who have been appointed in the farthest parts of the world,'[1] he may not be assuming that their status is the same as in Asia, or if he does think so he may be mistaken. His letter to the Romans mentions no bishop of that Church, and, though good reasons can be imagined for the omission, it seems on the whole best to suppose that Ignatius knew of no one at Rome who occupied the exact position to which the bishops in Syria and Asia Minor had attained.

---

[1] Eusebius, *H.E.* iii. 22 ; nothing is known of him, and there is no reason to suspect a mistake in the tradition.

[2] See Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, ii. 73 ff. *Phil.* x. tells how neighbouring Churches have sent bishops to the widowed see of Antioch ; conceivably their position relatively to the bishop of Antioch resembled that of the later 'country-bishops.'

[3] *Trall.* iii.

[4] *Smyrn.* viii.

(e) *Other Writings.* (i) Polycarp, writing to the Philippians shortly after Ignatius' journey to Rome, says: 'It is necessary . . . to be subject to the presbyters and deacons as to God and Christ.'[2] This looks as if the episcopi of Phil. i. 1 were now called presbyters; certainly Polycarp does not think it necessary to follow the example of Ignatius and insist upon the monarchical episcopate.

(ii) In the 'Martyrdom of Polycarp' (A.D. 156) Polycarp is termed 'an apostolic and prophetic teacher, bishop of the Catholic Church in Smyrna.'[3] It is interesting to note that the functions of the 'apostles, prophets, teachers' of 1 Cor. xii. have all devolved upon the bishop.

(iii) It is usually said that there is no mention of ordination in the second century. But in the 'Acts of Peter,' chap. x., our Lord is represented as laying His hands upon the Apostles. These Acts are not later than 200,[4] and in view of their unhistorical character the statement is probably evidence for the general Church custom of the second century.

(iv) The 'Ascension of Isaiah,' vi.–xi., is held to be of first-century Christian origin. If this is so, in chap. vi. we have valuable evidence, probably Palestinian, as to the working of Christian prophecy. Forty prophets come to see Isaiah at Jerusalem, 'to salute him and to hear his words. And that he might place his hands upon them, and that they might prophesy. . . .' So the laying on of hands upon prophets in a kind of ordination seems to have been practised as well as upon the ministers of whom we read in Acts vi.

---

[1] *οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὁρισθέντες*, *Eph.* iii.; *τὰ πέρατα* in *Rom.* vi. refers to Rome.

[2] Chap. v.

[3] Chap. xvi.

[4] So M. R. James. C. Schmidt in *Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen* says they were composed about 200 by a Catholic living in Asia Minor or Egypt.

VII. Conclusions. I will now try to summarise the evidence and indicate the course of development that seems to me probable.

The question, Did Jesus institute the Christian Ministry? seems to me wrongly framed. If He foresaw the life of the Church extending through *millennia*, such foresight was not shared by His first disciples. We see them, to begin with, ruling in imagination over the renovated Israel under the returned Lord Christ. At the end of the Apostolic Age, whatever hopes of the Parousia were still cherished, the idea of the Church and the ministry was very much what it is to us to-day. There is no point on which we can lay our finger and say: Just here and now have the notions held by the disciples during our Lord's ministry merged into the full Christian conception. There is an organic continuity between the old and the new.

Jesus, in His own view as in that of the disciples, was the Shepherd of God's flock. That is to say, He was an episcopus, a shepherd ruling and feeding the flock, ministering to its needs, and a watchman guarding it against enemies. After the Crucifixion the Apostles became episcopi in the sense in which Jesus had been an episcopus. When the task became too great for them, they took the momentous step of appointing assistants, who tended the flock under them. These assistants are best conceived of as forming an undifferentiated ministry, to which the functions both of episcopi and of deacons belonged. The action of the Apostles was inspired by that of Moses when confronted by similar difficulties, as recorded in Numbers. The conception of the duties incumbent on Apostles and assistants alike was formed with the help of the descriptions of spiritual shepherds given in the Prophets. As regards the details of these first institutions, the Christians followed the pattern of the Jewish life around them, as naturally as we in inaugurating a new movement choose a Committee, which in its turn chooses a Chairman and a Secretary.

Fundamental in the primitive Christian consciousness was the belief that Jesus, declared to be Lord and Christ by the Resurrection, was ruling His Church. This He did through the Spirit. The Spirit at this stage was believed to speak through inspired men who had the gift of exalted, sometimes ecstatic, utterance. They were in line with the prophets of old and declared the will of the Lord, now identified with Jesus Christ, unmistakably. Though the Apostles probably shared the prophetic gift, their appointment by Jesus outweighed any subsequent attestation, so that they were spoken of as ‘ the Twelve,’ or ‘ the Apostles ’ *par excellence*, not as prophets. From the very first, however, there were some, like James, whom an appearance of the Risen Christ had raised to apostolic dignity [1] ; the way was opened to a wider use of the word ‘ apostle.’ The primitive community at Jerusalem had a two-fold ministry under the Twelve, officials appointed after the manner of Jewish institutions and prophets whose appointment was testified to by the voice of the Spirit—it was founded on the apostles and prophets.

Thirty years pass and we find James head of the Mother Church, occupying the position that the Twelve had once held ; and under him a council of presbyters—presumably there were deacons also. The ministers are essentially the same as those whose appointment is described in Acts vi., but the aspect under which they appear to us is that of a body of men of mature age. Shortly before the Fall of Jerusalem James was martyred, and Symeon was appointed to succeed him.[2] A list of bishops at Jerusalem down to the time of Hadrian contains fifteen names. The number is suspiciously large, and some of them may have been rulers over other Palestinian Churches.[3] Theoretically we feel that the form of ministry which prevailed at Jerusalem must have had a great influence over the rest of the Church. As in point of fact it eventually spread everywhere, we are justified in supposing that a method of Church government

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 7 : ‘ to James ; then to all the apostles,’ following ‘ the Twelve,’ suggests this.

[2] Eus. *H.E.* iii. 11 ; iv. 5, 22.

[3] Eus. *H.E.* iv. 5. Zacchaeus, the fourth on the list, appears in *Clem. Recog.* iii. 66 as bishop of Caesarea. Hegesippus, *ap.* Eus. *H.E.* iii. 32, says that the descendants of Jude, reputed brother of the Lord, ‘ ruled (προηγοῦνται) every Church.’ The evidence, such as it is, suggests that others in Palestine had the same position *vis-à-vis* the presbyters as James had at Jerusalem.

which grew up under the eyes of the Apostles was regarded as having their sanction.

The second great centre of Christianity was Antioch. For geographical reasons an outward expansion of a Palestinian movement would pass to a large extent through that city. St. Peter, at least, of the Twelve made a stay there. But before his arrival the faith had been firmly established by the labours of missionaries from Jerusalem. These were of three kinds: first, apostles in the wider sense, such as Barnabas—'missionaries in chief' may serve to translate the word when it includes more than the Twelve; then prophets, men whose special vocation had been declared by signs visible to all; lastly, teachers—their task was to deliver with authority the Christian tradition. There was no clear line of division. An apostle might be a prophet and a teacher, a prophet might lose the power of exalted utterance and after a while be recognised only as a teacher. Here, then, in this second stage of the Church we have the three-fold universal ministry of which St. Paul speaks in 1 Cor. xii. St. Luke, describing the position at Antioch, speaks of 'prophets and teachers'; St. Paul would have said 'apostles, prophets and teachers.' This ministry is essentially a *missionary* one. There is no evidence for visiting prophets endowed with quasi-apostolic authority outside Palestine and Syria.[1] We conclude that this particular institution of a travelling band of evangelists with apostolic, prophetic, or didactic authority was characteristic of Syria. If this conclusion is right, we understand why the picture drawn by the 'Didache' is unique. Doubtless a local ministry was appointed, in Antioch and elsewhere, but for a time Syria was so much within the orbit of Jerusalem, and so many missionaries came with the prestige of 'headquarters,'[2] that the Churches had little incentive to develop local institutions. It may be surmised that after A.D. 70 Antioch was thrown upon its own resources, and before long modelled its ministry on the pattern of Jerusalem, with Euodius as its bishop. There may have been an earlier stage in which a college of episcopi [1] directed the affairs of the Church, a state of things which according to the usual interpretation is reflected in the 'Didache.'

---

[1] The passages are Acts xi. 27; xiii. 1; xv. 32; xxi. 10; *Did.* xi. Elsewhere the prophets are specially gifted members of the local Church, as in 1 Cor. xiv.; or St. Paul speaks of them as (*a*) one division of the original triad of the ministry (1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11); (*b*) associated with apostles in the origins of the Church (Eph. ii. 20; iii. 5)—in neither case need we think of them as a recognised institution west of Syria.

[2] Many Christian Jews will have gone to Jerusalem for the feasts and have returned through Syria with inspiration, sometimes prophetic, derived from contact with the Mother Church.

If Jerusalem shows us the headquarters of the original missionary movement, and Antioch a mission field looking for a time to Jerusalem as its home base, in St. Paul's Epistles we see a missionary of almost superhuman power organising his Churches on a basis of personal superintendence by the founder. As a rule he appointed a council of presbyters in each Church, whose duty it was to rule and teach with the help of those who had special gifts for this or that work. But the response to his teaching would not always permit this,[2] or the community was too unstable to make it desirable—this may have been the case at Corinth, where he seems to have tried a missionary experiment on the lines of democracy tempered by his personal supervision. His Epistles are always addressed to the Church, not to its officials, who are virtually ignored. By the end of his life, if the Pastorals are admitted as evidence, he felt the need of a strong ministry, differentiated into the two (or three) orders which had from the beginning been inherent in the office of presbyters and had already manifested themselves in practice in a division of labour, and took the necessary steps to introduce it.

A fourth stage appears at the beginning of the second century when bishops in the mon-episcopal sense are established in Syria and Western Asia Minor, and presumably in the intervening territory. Elsewhere, at Philippi, Corinth and Rome, the local Churches are governed by councils of episcopi or presbyters, the leader or chairman [3] of which was on his way to become a full bishop, and perhaps in some cases was already a *de facto* bishop.

Such in outline are the external facts as they appear to me: others will state them differently. Still more divergence arises when we try to fill in the gaps. We want to know so much. How and why did monarchical episcopacy come into being? Did the Apostles preside over the transition from the universal to the local ministry? As Professor Turner says: 'When we have explained how the supreme powers of the general ministry were made to devolve on an individual who belonged to the local ministry, we have explained the origin of episcopacy.'[1]

---

[1] See p. 40.

[2] As at Athens in Acts xvii.

[3] At least at Rome, in the case of Clement.

Some are content to point to Clement's assertion of Apostolical Succession (in a sense), to the three-fold ministry with a single bishop at its head found in the Ignatian Epistles, and to the details about ordination given in the Pastorals. Combining these data into a composite picture, they deduce the Catholic doctrine of episcopacy. The Apostles, they say, provided for a permanent ministry by ordaining bishops, as St. Paul ordained Timothy, with power to ordain successors in the episcopal office. Though such a theory cannot be disproved, it fails to convince other scholars, to whom the data seem too complicated to be explained so simply. Various occasions may have produced one-man rule:

1. An Apostle may have ordained a man to have episcopal authority, telling him to do the same in his turn, if necessity arose. To some readers this will seem a ridiculous understatement; others will think it goes beyond the evidence. My suggestion is that this was *one* of the causes of monarchical episcopacy, a mediating position unlikely to please. After all, the easiest explanation of the tradition is that it rests upon fact; but the later Church may have generalised too much.

2. Elsewhere than at Jerusalem men of outstanding personality doubtless ruled local Churches before their status as bishops was clearly defined.

3. A visiting prophet possessing the prestige of the Church at large settled in a Church and became its ruler.[2]

4. A missionary in chief sent a delegate armed with his authority, as St. Paul sent Timothy and Titus; if such a man remained permanently in the Church to which he was

---

[1] *Cambridge Medieval History*, i. 145.

[2] *Did.* xiii. 1.

sent, his double authority, local and representing the Church at large, made him indubitably a bishop.[1]

5. Following the pattern of the synagogue, over which a Head of the Synagogue (*rosh ha-keneset*) presided, chosen from among the ‘ presbyters ’ by co-optation, the Christian presbyters may have elected a permanent president, who, like the Jewish Head, had general oversight (ἐπισκοπή) of the public prayers and was responsible for the maintenance of order.[2]

6. In places there seems to have been an intermediate stage between the original ‘ presbyters in every city ’ and the single bishop—namely, a body of episcopi. The evidence for this has been discussed above, notably under the head of 1 Clement. It is *a priori* probable that words with such different origin as presbyter and episcopus were not used in the same context with an identical meaning. I suggest, therefore, that in some cities the necessity arose of appointing officers with other qualifications than those of the original presbyters who had been chosen for their age and standing. They would be at first executive officers charged with active pastoral oversight of the faithful and with the duty of keeping communications open with other parts of the Church. They may have been few in number, only two or three perhaps,[3] compared with a larger number of presbyters. We have only to imagine the emergence of young men with gifts of leadership in a Church where the presbyters were old and sluggish to visualise a state of things favourable to such a development. Such episcopi would be normally drawn from the presbyters, but some would be found suitable outside their ranks. If our theory, that the bishop, in so far as he emerged from the local Church, emerged from a group of episcopi rather than from the presbyters, is right, the later development of the ministry becomes more intelligible. It has always been a puzzle that the presbyters do not come to the front until the third century ; there is no sign of an earlier loss of position in

---

[1] The ‘ eminent men ’ of 1 Clement, according to our theory, had the same kind of authority as Timothy and Titus.

[2] See G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, i. 289.

[3] Possibly one for each house-church or separate meeting for edification in a large city with suburbs.

favour of the bishop. The youth of Bishop Damas of Magnesia supports our hypothesis,[1] which is in brief that the original undifferentiated ministry, which contained within itself the functions of the deacon and the episcopus, produced first a separate order of deacons, then one of episcopi.

This is speculative, but there can be no doubt as to the causes which led to mon-episcopacy, whatever the actual occasions in the individual Churches. The political trend of the age was strongly monarchical. The deaths of the Apostles and the fall of Jerusalem would cause a demand for centres of unity embodied in persons, and the institutions of Jerusalem would have unique authority. But far the most important factor was undoubtedly the celebration of the Eucharist. If there were separate meetings for edification in house-churches, on Sundays the Church, whenever possible, met in one centre for the Eucharist. Whoever habitually presided then, taking the place of the Lord Jesus in the Upper Room, was bound to acquire unique authority.

We have seen that the question whether the bishop came into existence by delegation from the Church at large or by elevation from the local Church cannot be answered with confidence ; probably one answer would be true of certain places, the other elsewhere. We must be content to remain in doubt. The important thing to realise is the double function of the bishop. Just as David the shepherd boy tended the flock but continually turned his eyes to the far horizon, for a possible approach of foes, so the bishop not only rules and feeds his flock but is ideally the link with the rest of the Church near and far, in space and time alike. He must act in union with the whole Church and guard the tradition of the faith. He is the agent through whom the control of the local Church by the whole Church, so insisted on in the apostolic and early sub-apostolic age, remains a living reality. We often forget how firm that control was. Except for the Gospels and Acts, and the private Epistle to Philemon, every book of the New Testament was addressed with authority to one or more

---

[1] Ign. *Magn.* iii.

Churches by a man with the right to speak in the name of the larger Church.[1] Clement speaks in the name of the Roman Church; the strength of Ignatius' commands is based on his position as bishop of Antioch; the Elder John writes from Ephesus. The conception of the Patriarchate is already present in germ; no Church lives to itself.

I have spoken of appointment of episcopi, avoiding so far the word 'ordination.' Granted that the Apostles presided over at least the beginnings of the process that led to mon-episcopacy, is there any evidence that ordination by laying on of hands was the universal rule? And is it safe to build on the testimony of Acts and the Pastorals, which are by no means universally regarded as trustworthy? In view of the practical absence of second-century support we must frankly say that the evidence is not cogent.[2] I venture to put forward a theory of my own; it has been hinted at in the earlier part of the essay.

Ordination by laying on of hands was an essentially Jewish custom. It was confined to Palestine, and it signified the conferring of jurisdiction. That the Apostles should have used it as described in Acts vi. is just what we should expect. They were on Palestinian soil and were giving the Seven jurisdiction over the Hellenistic Christians. Outside Palestine ordination would have seemed inappropriate until the Church had come to realise its independence of Judaism, and ideas of jurisdiction would be slow in developing. Whether St. Paul's appointing of presbyters was also ordination we cannot say; it may be that it was not till the end of his life that he deliberately planted a Jewish institution on Gentile soil. In doing so he brought into the Church Jewish ideas of Apostolical Succession, such as were bound up with the rite of *ṣĕmīkhah*. Ordination is simply a Jewish rite, *plus the difference Christ made*. I suggest that St. Paul in his old age, or later someone speaking in his name with such authority that he was not contradicted, deliberately insisted on the universal observance of a rite of Jewish origin. The earlier missionary experiments were abandoned and the Church reverted to type, claiming

---

[1] The Pastorals settle Church affairs through instructions to leaders.

[2] But how little second-century evidence there is for anything!

Ordination for itself just as it claimed that Jewish book the Old Testament.[1]

I suggest, then, that ordination was not at first practised in the Gentile Churches, but rapidly became universal as the Church realised its heritage. But it is always possible that the rite was practised everywhere from the first and was so axiomatic that writers did not trouble to mention it.[2]

It is time to abandon the pose of an inquiring Martian and come to grips with the questions of to-day, in the hope of solving which we spend labour on apparently insoluble problems of antiquity. Who has won? asks the Englishman with his incurably sporting instinct even without the prompting of Canon Streeter's already famous application of 'Alice in Wonderland': 'Everyone has won, and all shall have prizes.' I cannot see any ground for asserting that Presbyterianism or Independency has won. They are both sixteenth-century antiquarian reconstructions of the Apostolic Age without the Apostles. An independent congregation, without supervision from outside, never existed. So far as we can see, no individual presbyter ever ruled a Church, nor did a college of presbyters function without oversight (ἐπισκοπή) of either the larger Church or later a local bishop. Does Anglicanism fare any better with its claim, in the Preface to the Ordinal, 'that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons'? Certainly it does, for there were episcopi, presbyters and deacons in the New Testament, and we have seen reasons for distinguishing episcopi from presbyters ; and, if we are seeking facts rather than names, we have St. James ruling the Church at Jerusalem with presbyters and deacons. But it may be objected that this is a Pyrrhic victory. Compare two pictures : St. James presiding over the Christians at Jerusalem, with a council of elderly men or presbyters as advisers and a body of active workers or deacons ; and an Anglican presbyter presiding over the Church of a country town of 5000 inhabitants, with one deacon expecting to be a presbyter in a few weeks' time, and a bishop who last visited the parish three years ago. Anglicanism may have the names, but has it the thing ? None of us can claim to reproduce the institutions of the Apostolic Age, nor would they be suitable if they were reproduced. The real problem is of a different nature. The Church of the first centuries took a series of momentous steps, of which the acceptance of the Old Testament, the observance of the first day of the week, the adoption of episcopacy, the formulation of the faith in Creeds, and the fixing of the New Testament Canon were the most important. All these hang together. If we value antiquity we must take them all as the foundations of our Church life. Episcopacy was accepted at a very early date, the close of the Apostolic Age.[1] The details of its development are of minor interest. The important point to notice is that episcopacy in the minds of the majority of Christians is one of those things settled at so early a date, with the approval probably of the surviving Apostles, that it cannot be altered. The particular form taken by episcopacy in this or that country or age does not matter, if its essential features are observed. These, as we have seen, are the bishop's pastoral responsibility for a part of God's flock, and his representing of the authority of the universal Church, to which he is himself responsible. A bishop who neglects the latter is false to Catholic ideals.

---

[1] Harnack in his *Das A.T. in den paulinischen Briefen und in den paul. Gemeinden* (1928) asserts that, whereas in Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., and Gal. St. Paul is replying to attacks and uses his opponents' weapons and therefore quotes the O.T. freely, in 1 and 2 Thess., Eph., Col., Phil., Philemon he makes virtually no use of the O.T., and presupposes no reading of it by Gentile Churches.

[2] In the light of the passage quoted above from the *Ascension of Isaiah*, it is conceivable that even prophets were normally ordained. If such an idea were corroborated by fresh evidence, all kinds of preconceived opinions would have to be abandoned—a wholesome reminder of the limitations of our knowledge.

According to some scholars the first local ministry was one of episcopi-presbyters, in whom the episcopal power of ordination was inherent. To others this seems a quibble, or at best an unsatisfactory way of maintaining the doctrine of Apostolical Succession. My theory of an originally undifferentiated local ministry is a variant of it in some ways, but I cannot be certain that appointment was always true ordination by laying on of hands.

I believe that eventually the presbyterian conception of the Church will yield to the episcopal, beaten in fair argument. But hearts will remain as far asunder as ever unless justice is done to the real strength of the Free Church position, which is that the Holy Spirit in every age chooses His agents to declare His will, some of them being outside the hierarchical ministry. He spake, and speaks, by the prophets.[1] The Church is founded on the apostles *and prophets*. Apostolical Succession is a valuable truth, but is there no prophetic succession?

---

[1] Its authority is stronger than that of the border-line books of the N.T.

Jewish prophecy was of humble origin, connected with the dervish-like ecstasies of men who, falling into a trance with their eyes open, had no message wherewith to help the world. How came so respectable a man as Saul to be in such company? But in a succession of great seers—Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah and the like—the particular type of the human mind associated with prophecy appeared in men of sublime religious power, whom God used as agents of revelation. Prophecy was peculiarly liable to abuse—false prophets abounded—and after a time it died out. Some weeks after the Resurrection a great outburst of prophetic fervour occurred, accompanied by ecstatic phenomena, which we see, as St. Paul saw long ago, to be not of the essence of prophecy. Once more God used prophetic souls—men of intuitive rather than reasoning minds, peculiarly sensitive to spiritual influences—to declare His will. The Old Testament owes its power largely to the double witness, prophetic and institutional, which it contains. Our Lord in His human nature represented the prophetic strain at its purest, with no admixture of degrading alloy, and Christianity may be regarded as a hiving off from Judaism of its prophetic elements; in what was left the legalistic element was developed to an excess. The motive power of the young Church was largely prophetic. But prophecy is by its nature precarious, intermittent. The common sense of Christendom has prevented any attempt to form prophetic institutions, 'sons of the prophets.' Prophecy, too, is peculiarly liable to abuse ; false prophets are more often found than false apostles and are harder to keep in check—the institution repudiates the false apostle, the false prophet's credentials take longer to test. It was inevitable that the Church should develop institutions and that they should be on hierarchical lines. Its organic continuity with the old Israel, indeed the fact that it is composed of human beings, necessitates this. But somehow or other, both in our theory of the Church and in the practical working out of plans for reunion, if we are to be loyal to the partly prophetic origin of the Church, room must be found for a prophetic succession, intermittent though it be, as well as for Apostolical Succession. The real problem is not so much how to reconcile Canterbury and Edinburgh, as to find room for George Fox and the Sadhu, whom we all agree are true prophets, as unanimously as we agree that Mrs. Eddy was a false prophet.

---

[1] The words of the Nicene Creed are taken from Heb. i. 1, but we may suppose a time when they would have been applicable to the Christian prophets. Note how in certain early documents canonised O.T. prophets and Christian prophets melt into one another, so to speak. In the *Te Deum* 'prophets' following 'apostles' must have been originally Christian prophets. In the Liturgy of St. James (Brightman, p. 50) we have 'spirits of just men and prophets, souls of martyrs and apostles,' and in the Abyssinian Liturgy (Brightman, p. 206) 'prophets, apostles, martyrs, archpopes, presbyters, deacons, etc.' are mentioned. The prophets seem to have been originally Christian prophets, put before apostles when prophecy died out in the Church.

I have laboured this point because I feel that discussions about Free Church Orders are largely beside the mark ; the real issue is whether the Holy Spirit in this age is entering men's hearts and calling them to a ministry by the side of the traditional apostolical ministry of the Catholic Church. It will hardly be doubted that He is so doing, or (by Episcopalians) that He normally works through the descendants of the Apostles. How then can we give practical expression to our belief that the Church is founded on 'the apostles and prophets' ?

II

THE POSITION OF CLERGY AND LAITY IN THE EARLY CHURCH IN RELATION TO THE EPISCOPATE

By A. J. MACLEAN, Bishop of Moray, Ross, and Caithness

THE object of this essay is to consider the relative position of bishops, clergy, and laity in early times, let us say in the first five centuries of our era; to discuss how the ministry was appointed, what part the different classes of Christians took in synods, and the relation of the bishop in his diocese to them. It is always necessary, in making such an investigation, to remember that in the early centuries, as in the later, customs varied greatly in different countries, and that they often changed more rapidly from time to time than has sometimes been supposed.

I. The Appointment of Bishops and Clergy. We may inquire what part the clergy and laity took in these appointments. Beginning with the New Testament, we notice that we are not told how, when a successor to Judas Iscariot had to be chosen, Matthias and Joseph Barsabbas were put forward.[1] Peter had stated the qualifications; and it seems more probable that 'the brethren' selected the two names than that the Eleven Apostles did so. Of the two, Matthias was chosen by lot. When the Seven, commonly called Deacons, were appointed[2] by the Twelve in Acts, they had been previously chosen[3] by the people. The Twelve prayed and laid hands on them.[4] The presbyters in 'every Church' in a part of Asia Minor were appointed with prayer by Paul and Barnabas, those in Crete by Titus [1]; but it is not said if the people elected them. Timothy received the gift by prophecy—perhaps by the indication of a Christian prophet—with (*μετά*) the laying on of hands of the presbytery,[2] through (*διά*) the laying on of Paul's hands.[3] St. Paul is said in the Pastoral Epistles himself to have appointed Timothy and Titus to their spheres of work in Ephesus and Crete.[4]

---

[1] Acts i. 23: ἔστησαν.

[2] Acts vi. 3.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] Verse 6.

For the post-apostolic age we have little evidence. In the well-known passage in Clement of Rome about the continuance of the ministry [5] the 'bishops' are appointed [6] by the Apostles and afterwards by other men of repute,[7] with the consent[8] of the whole Church. In the 'Didache' (*c.* A.D. 120?) the people are told to appoint, or elect,[9] for themselves 'bishops' and deacons. In this work, as in Clement, the word 'bishop' is used in its New Testament sense.

For the third century Cyprian is our chief witness. He speaks [10] of bishops and presbyters being appointed with at least the consent of the laity. With regard to one Aurelius, ordained a reader, he says: [11] 'In ordination of the clergy we usually consult you beforehand, and weigh the character and deserts of individuals with the general advice.' He himself had been chosen by the people; he speaks [12] of the 'venom' of certain presbyters against his episcopate, 'that is against [the people's] suffrage and God's judgment.' Elsewhere he says [1] that Pope Cornelius was made bishop by bishops in Rome, ' by the testimony of almost all the clergy, by the suffrage of the people who were then present.' Writing [2] about Basilides and Martial, two bishops who had lapsed, and whose sees had been filled by other bishops, he says that the priest should be chosen in the presence of the people, under the eyes of all, and should be approved worthy and suitable by public judgment and testimony ; he refers to Acts i. 15, vi. 2, and says that this was done in the ordination of deacons as well as in that of bishops and presbyters, lest anyone should be appointed who was unworthy. All the neighbouring bishops of the same province should assemble for the ordination of a prelate, which should be by the suffrage of the whole brotherhood. Thus Cyprian bears witness to popular election or at least assent, but ordination by the bishop or bishops.

---

[1] Acts xiv. 23 (*χειροτονήσαντες*); Tit. i. 5 (*καταστήσῃς*); *cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 2. We may here notice that each of the words *χειροτονία*, *χειροθεσία*, and *κατάστασις*, with their corresponding verbs, is used in different senses in Christian antiquity. The first originally meant election by a show of hands, and came to be a general word for appointment to clerical office, whether it referred to election (but a show of hands was probably not used in the Early Church) or to what we call ordination; in most cases it neither affirms nor denies the laying on of the hand. The second word usually has more emphatic reference to the laying on of the hand, whether in ordination or at other times; but it is sometimes used in other senses; *e.g.* it means 'a blessing,' or 'raising the hand in blessing.' The third word is used of appointment—election or ordination or both—to all grades in the ministry.

[2] 1 Tim. iv. 14; see below.

[3] 2 Tim. i. 6.

[4] 1 Tim. i. 3; Tit. i. 5.

[5] *Cor.* 44.

[6] *καταστα θέντας*.

[7] *ἐλλογίμων*.

[8] *συνευδοκησάσης*.

[9] *χειροτονήσατε*; see above.

[10] The numbering of Cyprian's Epistles varies greatly in the different editions.

[11] *Ep.* xxxii. (xxxviii).

[12] *Ep.* xxxix. (xliii.) 1, to the People; so in *Ep.* liv. (lix.) 6, to Cornelius.

Most of the evidence of the fourth century is similar. Of Athanasius we read [3] that the people shouted that he should be bishop of their Church, and that he was elected by the bishops ' in the sight of, and with the acclamation of, all the people ' ; and Gregory of Nazianzus [4] says of Athanasius that ' by the vote of the whole people . . . he is led up to the throne of St. Mark ' (Alexandria).

The Church Orders use similar language ; and now, by the generally accepted investigations of Dom Connolly, the earliest, or almost the earliest, of them is shown to be, at least in the main, Hippolytus' ' Apostolic Tradition,' and therefore it gives evidence for the early part of the third century. The bishop is ' elected by all the people ' ; they and the presbyters and bishops assemble on a Lord's day. All consenting, the bishops lay hands on the candidate, the presbyters stand in silence, one of the bishops prays.[5] The evidence is now carried down to the end of the fourth century by the discovery of the Oriental versions of Hippolytus' work[1]; and also by independent Church Orders based on it, like the 'Testament of Our Lord'[2] (*c.* A.D. 350?), the so-called 'Canons of Hippolytus,'[3] which must be distinguished from the 'Apostolic Tradition,' and the 'Apostolic Constitutions,' book viii. (*c.* A.D. 375?).[4] These use similar language, as does the still later 'Arabic Didascalia,'[5] which has not yet been published in its entirety.

---

[1] *Ep.* li. (lv.) 8, to Antonianus.

[2] *Ep.* lxvii. 4 f., to the Spanish clergy and people.

[3] *Apol. c. Arian.* 6.

[4] *Orat.* xxi. 5.

[5] Connolly, *So-called Egyptian Church Order*, p. 175 ; Hauler, *Verona Latin Fragments*, p. 103 ; the Latin is nearest to Hippolytus' Greek original, now lost.

The 'Life of Polycarp,' by Pseudo-Pionius, is of no use for evidence of custom in the time of Polycarp, but is valuable for that of the end of the fourth century.[6] In this work[7] the deacons were sent to the laity to inquire whom they would have (as bishop), and they said with one accord 'Let Polycarp be our pastor and teacher.' The whole of the priesthood[8] then having assented, they appointed[9] him. . . . Accordingly the deacons led him up for ordination[10] by the hands of the bishops, according to custom.

We must now go back somewhat, to the first Œcumenical Council, that of Nicaea, A.D. 325, which laid down rules for the comprovincial bishops appointing[11] a bishop, with confirmation by the metropolitan.[12] At least three must meet and proceed to the ordination.[13] But nothing is said about election by the people, and it was afterwards maintained by the Greeks that Nicaea took away this right.[14] But the argument from silence, always precarious, is here negatived by those Church Orders which were later than Nicaea, and by the 'Gallican Statutes'[15]; these are emphatic as to popular election. At the same time it must be said that the regulation that at least three bishops must attend was made so as to secure the assent of the comprovincials, a necessary element in all episcopal elections; the idea of a possible invalidity in the orders of one bishop being remedied by the presence of others could hardly have been thought of at so early a date.

---

[1] The Sahidic version, § 31, ed. Tattam, p. 32, and the Ethiopic, § 22. These have fourth-century additions.

[2] i. 20.

[3] Can. ii. (ed. Achelis, § 39 f).

[4] viii. 4. Writers like the author of the *Apostolic Constitutions* or Tertullian are invaluable as witnesses of the existence of customs, whatever we may think of their own opinions.

[5] § 36; Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, ii. 125 f.

[6] It may be read in Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, iii. 431 ff.

[7] § 22 f.

[8] *τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ.*

[9] *ἀνέστησαν.*

[10] *χειροθεσία.*

[11] *καθίστασθαι.*

[12] Can. 4, 6.

[13] *χειροτονία.*

[14] Hefele, *History of the Christian Councils*, i. 385, Eng. tr.

[15] See below.

Similar enactments as to bishops being present were made by the First Council of Arles,[1] A.D. 314, and as to confirmation by the metropolitan [2] by the Second, A.D. 443 or 452, and elsewhere, no reference being made to popular election. The so-called 'Apostolic Canons,' which in their present form may be dated *c.* A.D. 400, say that a bishop is to be ordained [3] by two or three bishops, a presbyter, deacon, and the other clerks by one bishop[4]; and so the 'Apostolic Constitutions,' [5] and the 'Ethiopic Didascalia.' [6] At Ancyra,[7] A.D. 314, there is perhaps an oblique reference to popular election; this council speaks of bishops being appointed [8] to a diocese,[9] but not received by it.

The Council of Laodicea in Phrygia, held *c.* A.D. 380, or perhaps earlier, definitely says that bishops are to be appointed by the other bishops, and that the choice of those who are to be appointed to the priesthood [10] shall not rest with the multitude.[11] The canons of the Councils of Antioch *in encaeniis* (A.D. 341), and of Sardica (A.D. 344 or 347) do not seem to throw light on the subject.

On the other hand, the 'Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua,' often erroneously called the Canons of the supposed Fourth Synod of Carthage, A.D. 398, but really 'Gallican Statutes,' as Bishop John Wordsworth rightly calls them, expressly say [12] (*c.* A.D. 500) that the bishop must be ordained with the consent of clergy and laity, and in the presence of the comprovincial bishops, with the authority of the metropolitan; and that a bishop must not ordain anyone without the advice of the clergy, and must seek the acquiescence [13] and testimony of the citizens.[14] It would seem that the right of the laity to take part in the election of bishops lasted longer in the West than in the East.

[1] Can. 20; 'seven, or at least three.'

[2] Can. 5.

[3] *χειροτονείσθω.*

[4] Can. 1, 2. These Canons are now attached to *Apost. Const.* bk. viii.

[5] iii. 20; viii. 27.

[6] Eng. tr. by J. M. Harden, Bishop of Tuam, p. 97.

[7] Can. 18.

[8] *κατaστάθεντες.*

[9] *παροικία.*

[10] Or 'sanctuary,' *ἱερατεῖον.*

[11] Can. 12, 13.

[12] They are given in Hefele, ii. 410 ff.

[13] *Conniventiam.*

[14] Stat. 1, 22.

The provision for the assent of the presbyters to the ordination of a presbyter, such as it is, is exemplified by the ancient custom, which still exists, of their laying on hands with the bishop in that case. It is found in all versions of Hippolytus' 'Apostolic Tradition,' [1] in the 'Testament of Our Lord,' [2] the 'Gallican Statutes,'[3] and elsewhere, though not (probably) in the 'Apostolic Constitutions' and not in the so-called 'Canons of Hippolytus.' The assent of the laity to the ordination of presbyters and deacons finds a later echo in the *Si Quis*, which is still required before a priest or deacon is ordained, calling on objectors to state their case.

The interference of the Emperors in episcopal elections after the Empire became Christian was much opposed. A comparatively late 'Apostolic Canon' [4] says that a bishop who obtains a church, that is, a see, by the secular powers, is to be deposed.

It is unnecessary here to deal with the case of the appointment to the see of Alexandria. Whatever the real history of the matter may have been—and there is no agreement as to what it was—the case was confessedly exceptional, and did not apply to other dioceses.[5]

The general result of the evidence seems to be that in the earlier period of Church history, all orders in the Church, bishops, clergy, and laity, were normally consulted in making appointments to the ministry. But it would be a mistake to transfer modern ideas to ancient times, and to think of elections being made by show of hands or by voting papers. The assent would ordinarily be by acclamation.

II. The Presence of Clergy and Laity at Synods. There is no question that Synods, other than purely diocesan ones, were essentially Synods of bishops; so they are expressly called by Eusebius,[6] and in the Canons of Nicaea [7] and Chalcedon,[8] and elsewhere. The only question is, what part the clergy and laity took in them.

---

[1] For the Latin see Connolly, p. 178; Hauler, p. 108.

[2] i. 30.

[3] Stat. 3.

[4] Can. 31 or 29.

[5] For this matter see Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, Appended Note B (a fuller edition by Dr. Gore and Dr. C. H. Turner published in 1919); and Lightfoot, *Dissertation on the Christian Ministry*, in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians.

[6] *H.E.* v. 23.

[7] Can. 5.

[8] Can. 19.

In the council of Acts xv. presbyters and the Jerusalem laity were present. The Apostles and presbyters assembled to consider the matter of the Judaizers, a doctrinal question. There was much questioning, and Peter spoke. The 'multitude' were present, and 'kept silence' while Barnabas, Paul, and James spoke; and the Apostles and presbyters 'with the whole Church' thought good to choose delegates to carry the decision to the Gentiles in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia; but the letter ran in the name of the Apostles and presbyters alone, whether we treat the word 'brethren' as in apposition to the latter noun or to both nouns; the Authorised Version has a faulty reading here. From these facts various deductions have been drawn. Did the laity join in the discussion? Or was that which preceded the 'keeping silence' a burst of applause? But in any case there was no question of voting. The Apostles carried the clergy and laity with them, and there was general agreement.

The meeting of Acts xxv. 18 ff. was what later would be called a 'Diocesan Synod.' James and 'all the presbyters' were present to meet Paul and his party. There is no mention of any of the Jerusalem laity attending.

Very little is known of the larger Synods of the second century. Bishops held them; but whether any others besides bishops were present, for example as witnesses, we do not know. At the beginning of the century Ignatius speaks [1] of the presidency of the bishop, and of the presbyters being after the likeness of the council [2] of the Apostles. He visualises the presbyters as the bishop's advisers at a 'Diocesan Synod.'

For the third century we have more evidence. Origen, who had been ordained presbyter in Palestine, and had long been famous as a teacher at Alexandria and elsewhere, was invited to a Synod of bishops in Arabia to argue against the Hypnopsychites, as he had before been invited to argue with Beryllus, bishop of Bostra, about A.D. 244.[3] Cyprian gives us information about the Roman province of 'Africa.'

---

[1] *Magn.* 6.

[2] συνέδριον; cf. *Trall.* 2, and *Eph.* 4, 'the presbyter attuned to the bishop as its strings to a lyre.'

[3] Eusebius, *H.E.* vi. 33, 37.

He speaks [1] of a Synod of bishops at Carthage in which the presbyters sat with them. Elsewhere [2] he says that the Roman clergy wrote to him about holding a Synod with bishop, presbyters, deacons, confessors, and 'standing' [3] laity, to deal with the case of the lapsed. Elsewhere [4] he tells his people that he will call his brother bishops together and the confessors and the laity, to examine the letters of the martyrs. Writing to Pope Cornelius [5] he speaks of presbyters and deacons judging. In an early letter to his presbyters and deacons [6] he uses a well-known phrase: 'From the beginning of my episcopate I determined to do nothing on my own opinion, without your advice,[7] and without the concurring feeling [8] of the people.' This phrase has often been misunderstood as if 'consensus' meant the same thing as our word 'consent'; that is, as if Cyprian allowed the laity to veto his actions. This would have given the laity a higher power than was given to the presbyters and deacons, who could only advise. What Cyprian wisely determined to do was to carry his people with him. There was no question of a First, Second, and Third Chamber, any one of which could veto the decisions of the others. It will also be remembered that the matters about which Cyprian writes dealt mainly with the restoration or the reverse of those who had lapsed in persecutions. The questions were disciplinary rather than doctrinal.

At the Third Council of Carthage,[9] *c.* A.D. 256, eighty-seven bishops and many presbyters, deacons and laymen were present. For Cappadocia we have the evidence of Firmillian, who writes to Cyprian of yearly provincial Synods at which were present *seniores et praepositi*, that is, presbyters and bishops.[10] In a Synod at Antioch, *c.* A.D. 269 or earlier, which was held by many bishops, a learned presbyter named Malchion refuted Paul of Samosata.[11]

---

[1] *Ep.* lxv. (lxvi).

[2] *Ep.* li. (lv.) 5, to Antonianus; the letter of the Roman clergy is given in Cyprian, *Ep.* xxx. (xxxi.).

[3] *Stantes*, who had not lapsed in persecution.

[4] *Ep.* xi. (xvii.) 3.

[5] *Ep.* liv. (lix.) 15.

[6] *Ep.* v. (xiv.) 4.

[7] *Consilium.*

[8] *Consensus.*

[9] Hefele, i. 102.

[10] Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxiv. (lxxv.) 4.

[11] Eusebius, *H.E.* vii. 29.

In the fourth century, after the coming of peace to the Church, Synods greatly increased, and we have a good deal of evidence as to those who were present.[1] At Elvira (Illiberis) in Spain, *c.* A.D. 305, the synodical Acts say that there were present nineteen bishops, twenty-four (or more) presbyters, who were seated like the bishops, and deacons and lay people also attended. The decrees ran in the name of the bishops only.[2] At Arles, A.D. 314, there were many presbyters and deacons, some acting as proxies for absent bishops. The Pope sent two presbyters and two deacons as his delegates. Each bishop brought two presbyters, and some brought deacons also.[3] At the Œcumenical Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325, a great multitude of presbyters, deacons, and acolytes accompanied the bishops ; and Athanasius, then a deacon, was present, and spoke strongly against Arius.[4] Sozomen says that the bishops brought learned laymen with them to take part in the discussions. The Emperor Constantine was present and made a speech.[5] The Pope was represented by two Roman presbyters, and, as some think, also by Hosius, bishop of Cordova ; Socrates[6] mentions him first in his list of bishops.

The Council of Antioch *in encaeniis*, A.D. 341, ordered Synods to be held in each eparchy or province twice a year, at one of which presbyters and deacons and any who claimed to have been wrongly treated were to appear. To Sardica the Pope sent two presbyters as delegates. Presbyters and deacons were present at four Carthaginian Synods, A.D. 387–401, at Toledo A.D. 400, at a council in Constantinople A.D. 448 or 443, at which Eutyches was deposed, and twenty-three archimandrites attended ; also at the Ephesus Robber Council,[7] A.D. 449, to which Barsumas the archimandrite was specially invited by the Emperor, and at four councils in Rome, A.D. 461–502.[8]

---

[1] We need not notice here chorepiscopi, who except in the Far East were ordinarily bishops.

[2] Hefele, i. 132.

[3] *Ibid.* i. 181.

[4] Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* iii. 8 ; Sozomen, *H.E.* i. 17 ; Socrates, *H.E.* i. 8.

[5] Socrates, *H.E.* i. 8.

[6] i. 13.

[7] *Latrocinium, σύνοδος ληστρική.*

[8] Hefele, i. 20 ; A. W. Haddan, art. ' Council,' in Smith and Cheetham's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, i. 480*a*.

At the Œcumenical Councils of Ephesus (A.D. 431) and Chalcedon (A.D. 451) deacons acted as notaries. The Pope sent two bishops and a presbyter to Ephesus, a bishop and some other delegates to Chalcedon, to represent him; but there was no papal delegate at Constantinople, A.D. 381.

The Emperor was present in person at Nicaea, Constantinople, and Chalcedon, and sent a representative to Ephesus; these were the first four œcumenical councils. At Chalcedon the external business was managed by the Imperial Commissioners, who took the votes; but they left the internal business to the Synod itself.[1] The Emperors wrote that their representative at Ephesus was to have no share in the discussions which might take place about doctrine, 'for it is unlawful that one who is not on the list of the holy bishops should mingle in the affairs of the Church.'[2] This was apparently the usual attitude of the Emperors to the Councils.

It remains to determine what part was taken by those who were present at provincial or œcumenical councils, but were not bishops. This question has been much debated. We must first notice that the decrees of these councils were usually signed only by bishops and delegates of absent bishops, even if presbyters were present; so it was at Ephesus and Chalcedon. At Constantinople, A.D. 381, three presbyters subscribe in their own names. But it was somewhat rare for presbyters to sign decrees; if they did so, they usually signed by a formula different from that of the bishops, unless they were bishop's delegates. No lay signature appears in the Acts of the great Synods.[3]

Until the latter part of the fifth century, as it would appear from the evidence, no one but bishops and representatives of absent bishops had the right of vote or veto in councils, though presbyters and deacons and lay people were usually present at them, in special cases by invitation, and sometimes were requested to speak and advise, even at

[1] Hefele, iii. 296.

[2] Acts of the Council of Ephesus, quoted by D. Stone in Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, iv. 189*a*.

[3] For these statements, see Haddan, i. 481 f.; Hefele, i. 20, etc.; D. Stone, *E.R.E.* iv. 186.

the œcumenical Synods.[1] There is no known instance of laymen having a vote in diocesan or any other synod, in the period under consideration. At the same time we must be on our guard against importing modern ideas of counting heads into ancient records; it was not in that way that the clergy and laity exercised an undoubted influence in Church affairs, especially in matters of administration. It must further be remembered that the great councils of our period were mainly concerned with doctrine, as to which the writers of that time held that the laity, as laity, had no commission to give decisions.[2]

III. Relation of the Clergy of a Diocese to their Bishop. *Presbyters* are the bishop's advisers and council,[3] as we have seen in Ignatius; and also in the 'Older Didascalia,'[4] the 'Apostolic Constitutions,'[5] and elsewhere. But we may consider their relation to the bishop in their ministerial capacity. Theoretically the bishop himself administers the sacraments and sacramental rites in his diocese; but as he cannot be everywhere at once, the presbyters act as his deputies for doing so. As the 'Apostolic Constitutions' say,[6] the presbyter has the function of baptizing, celebrating the Eucharist, blessing and teaching. His right to celebrate the Eucharist is recognised by Clement of Rome[7]; and by implication in the 'Didache,'[8] where the appointment of 'bishops' and deacons is expressly said to be because of the Eucharist which had just been described. It is recognised also at Nicaea,[9] in the 'Testament of Our Lord,'[10] the 'Apostolic Constitutions[11] and elsewhere.

Preaching is recognised in early writers as the peculiar duty of the bishops. In Justin Martyr's account of the Eucharist[12] the 'president' alone is said to preach. Sozomen says[13] that at Alexandria the bishop alone preached, ever since the days of Arius, but that in Rome there was, in Sozomen's time, no preaching in church either by the bishop or by anyone else. The presbyter's right to preach, however, was recognised from the first. In the Pastoral Epistles some presbyters are said to labour in the word and in teaching.[1] In the Ancient Homily which was formerly known as the Second Epistle of Clement of Rome, we read [2] of the presbyters admonishing in the public service; and this is implied in the first canon of Ancyra (A.D. 314), where lapsed presbyters are forbidden to 'offer' (the Eucharist) or to preach. That interesting pilgrim from the West, whom we know as 'Etheria' or 'Silvia,' speaks of a long 'diet of preaching' at Jerusalem, by many presbyters, and then by the bishop, every Sunday.[3] This was probably at the end of the fourth century.

---

[1] For the position of presbyters in Roman councils, *c.* A.D. 500, which was to lead to the introduction of abbots and others into Western councils, and to the privileged position of the Lower Houses of Convocation in England, see Stone, *loc. cit.*

[2] See below, IV., and above.

[3] *βουλή.*

[4] Hauler, p. 40; Funk i. 108.

[5] ii. 28.

[6] iii. 20; 'blessing' here perhaps includes absolving.

[7] *Cor.* 44.

[8] § 15; note the word 'therefore.'

[9] Can. 18.

[10] i. 31.

[11] vii. 26.

[12] *Apol.* i. 67.

[13] *H.E.* vii. 19, fifth century.

The presbyter, however, could not ordain, even to the minor orders. This is emphatically stated in Hippolytus' 'Apostolic Tradition,'[4] in the Latin as well as in the Oriental versions; in the 'Apostolic Constitutions,'[5] the 'Ethiopic Didascalia,'[6] the so-called 'Canons of Hippolytus,'[7] and elsewhere. An ordination by a presbyter Colluthus was declared by an Alexandrian Council, A.D. 324, to have been null and void.[8]

The authorities in our period speak of a bishop being normally the only minister of confirmation; but there are some exceptions. Jerome [9] says, 'What does a bishop that a presbyter does not, except ordination?' and the so-called 'Canons of Hippolytus' use nearly the same language [10];

---

[1] 1 Tim. v. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 2.

[2] § 17.

[3] For the text see Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, Eng. tr., p. 495.

[4] Connolly, p. 179; Hauler, p. 110.

[5] iii. 11, 20; viii. 28.

[6] § 16.

[7] Can. iv. (ed. Achelis, § 32).

[8] Athanasius, *Apol. c. Arian.* 11 f. Particular cases of ordinations by presbyters were alleged by Dr. Hatch in his *Bampton Lectures* and by Dr. Lightfoot in his *Dissertation*. Reasons for not accepting these cases have been given by several writers, in particular by Dr. Gore in the Appended Notes to *The Church and the Ministry*. Most of the instances seem to be cases where 'to ordain' must mean 'to procure the ordination of.' The others are the thirteenth Canon of Ancyra, where the text and translation are very uncertain, and the exceptional case of Alexandria already mentioned. Whatever view be taken of this question, it ought not to be confused with the question of the different theories held as to the origin of the diocesan episcopate.

[9] *Ep.* 146, to Evangelus.

[10] *Loc. cit.*

we see that both these writers forbid a presbyter to ordain. Confirmation by a presbyter is perhaps allowed in the 'Apostolic Constitutions,' which say [1] that a presbyter lays on hands [2] but does not ordain [3]; but the former verb is interpreted by some of absolution, or of the part taken by presbyters at a presbyter's ordination. There were also certain exceptions to the rule that only a bishop can confirm mentioned in Augustine and Gregory the Great, and found later in Gaul, Spain, and Ireland.[4] Confirmation by presbyters became the usual practice in the East, but the chrism was consecrated, except among the East Syrians, by the patriarch or bishop.[5] And the writer whom we call Ambrosiaster says [6] that in Egypt the presbyter 'signs' [7] in the absence of the bishop. This would be at the end of the fourth century; and it surely refers to confirmation, for the idea that it may refer to ordination can hardly be maintained.

An interesting example of the close connexion of bishops and presbyters is seen in the ancient and still existing custom of 'concelebration,' that is to say, the bishop and presbyters uniting in offering up the elements at the Eucharist, all laying their hands on them, and in some cases saying the prayer of consecration aloud together.[8] The joint action at the Offertory is found in all versions of the 'Apostolic Tradition,' [9] in the 'Testament of Our Lord,' where also the people join audibly in saying all or part of two of the prayers,[10] and in the so-called 'Canons of Hippolytus.'[11] The custom of concelebration is retained to this day in the Roman rite, at the ordination of presbyters.[12]

A *Deacon* also has a special, but different, relation to the bishop. He is the servant or minister [13] of the bishop.[14]

---

[1] viii. 28.

[2] χειροθετεῖ, so most of the MSS.

[3] οὐ χειροτονεῖ.

[4] See *Confirmation* (S.P.C.K., 1926), vol. 1, pp. 54–57.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 39 f.

[6] *In Eph.* iv. 12.

[7] *Consignat.*

[8] So the Ethiopic version of the *Apostolic Tradition* according to Ludolf.

[9] Hauler, p. 106; Connolly, p. 176.

[10] i. 23.

[11] Can. iii. (ed. Achelis, § 20).

[12] For further details of the relations of bishop and presbyter, see the present writer's article, 'Ministry (Early Christian),' in Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.*

[13] ὑπηρέτης.

[14] Nicaea, can. 18; cf. *Apost. Const.* ii. 26.

The 'Apostolic Tradition,'[1] in all its versions, and the 'Testament of Our Lord,'[2] emphasise the fact that this is the reason why the bishop ordains him alone; that is, the presbyters do not lay hands on him, as when a presbyter is ordained. They say that the deacon is not ordained to the priesthood,[3] and does not receive the 'spirit of the presbyterate of which the presbyters are partakers.' In a few cases the deacon is said to be an assistant to the presbyters also.[4] In the 'Older Didascalia'[5] the deacon is the ear, mouth, heart, and soul of the bishop; the parallel 'Apostolic Constitutions'[6] add 'the eye,' and the 'Testament of Our Lord'[7] says that he is 'in everything as the eye of the Church.'

There are many signs that the deacons were pressing their claims both in the third and in the fourth centuries. The eighteenth canon of Nicaea severely represses them. They may not administer the Eucharist to presbyters, still less receive Holy Communion before the bishops; they must remain within their own limits[8]; they have not the power of offering,[9] that is of celebrating the Eucharist. The First Council of Arles, A.D. 314, makes the same prohibition, saying that many deacons did attempt to 'offer.'[10] And so most of the Church Orders rebuke their excessive claims, except the 'Testament of Our Lord,' which rather magnifies them. Whereas Hippolytus says that the deacon is not 'partaker of counsel in the clergy,' the 'Testament' (as we read it in the Syriac, the Greek being lost) says that he is the counsellor of the whole clergy.[11]

Nevertheless the functions of the deacon as servant of the bishop were numerous; he assisted the bishop, or presbyter, in the eucharistic liturgy; he usually communicated the people; he assisted at baptism; he said the ectene or litany, and, curiously enough, in the 'Testament of Our Lord'[1] he added a clause to it to intercede for those who came in late, praying that in future they might be more diligent. The deacon visited the sick, reported cases to the bishop, and did much pastoral work as his minister; he buried strangers[2]; he was usually allowed to baptize in the absence of the presbyter[3]; and he occasionally, but very rarely, preached, if commanded by the bishop. Ephrem Syrus, a great preacher in the fourth century, was a deacon. The idea that he was a presbyter comes from his speaking of his having the talent of the 'priesthood' (Syr. *kahnutha*), but this Syriac word includes the diaconate.

---

[1] Hauler, p. 109; Connolly, pp. 178 f.

[2] i. 38.

[3] *Sacerdotium.*

[4] *Canons of Hippolytus*, v. (ed. Achelis, § 34). So *Gallican Statutes*, 4, and *Older Didascalia.*

[5] Funk, i. p. 138.

[6] ii. 44.

[7] i. 35.

[8] *μέτροις.*

[9] *προσφέρειν.*

[10] *Offerre*, can. 15. *Cf.* can. 15 of the Second Council of Arles and *Apost. Const.* viii. 28 (*οὐ προσφέρει*).

[11] Possibly the Syriac translator, Jacob of Edessa, read *σύμβουλος* for *σύμβολον.*

Some of the deacons were told off to keep order in the church assembled for worship, and to guard the doors; but there are some indications that by degrees they tended to shift this part of their duties on to the shoulders of subdeacons.

Of the relation of the *Minor Orders* to the bishop much need not here be said. But the reader appears in ancient times to have had a special position with regard to the bishop, for the importance of the office lay in the fact that he had often to interpret as well as to read. In the old manual named by Dr. Bickell the 'Apostolic Church Order,'[4] of the end of the third century, the reader is placed before the deacon,[5] and the author insists on his being learned and able to expound,[6] for he takes the place of an evangelist. It is curious that this Church Order[7] makes no such qualification necessary in the case of a bishop. The bishop should be 'one who is able to explain the Scriptures, but if he knows not letters[8] he shall be meek, and humble,' and so forth.[9] The other Church Orders also insist on the necessity of the reader being learned,[1] and we note his importance in Justin's ' First Apology,' quoted above.

---

[1] i. 36.

[2] *Testament of Our Lord*, ibid.

[3] Elvira, can. 77 (in can. 38 even laymen are allowed to baptize in case of necessity). But in *Apost. Const.* viii. 28 the deacon is forbidden to baptize.

[4] To be read in Latin in Hauler's *Verona Fragments*, pp. 93 f., and more fully in Arendzen's Syriac text with English translation in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, iii. 60 ff.; and elsewhere.

[5] § 19.

[6] διηγητικός, *narrabilis*.

[7] § 16.

[8] ἀγράμματος.

[9] So, less strongly, the *Older Didascalia* and the parallel *Apost. Const.* ii. 1 (Funk, i. 30 f.).

The Minor Orders were in some cases ordained with laying on of hands, in some cases without it. Basil [2] distinguishes between clerks who are in orders [3] and the ministry which is conferred without imposition of hands. The Church Orders vary in their directions about this matter. They say that the Minor Orders are to be ordained, but most of them add, not with laying on of hands.[4] In the ' Apostolic Constitutions,' [5] however, deaconesses, subdeacons, and readers are ordained with the imposition of hands. The Epitome [6] formerly known as ' Constitutions through Hippolytus,' whether it is a short form of our ' Apostolic Constitutions,' book viii., or of an earlier draft of it, agrees with this rule except in the case of a reader, of whom it says that ' he does not receive the laying on of the hand.' [7] It is probable that the earlier custom was for the bishop to ordain these Minor Orders without laying on his hand, but that the writer of the ' Apostolic Constitutions ' inserted it, while the Epitomizer (if later than our ' Apostolic Constitutions ') and the Egyptian Church did not altogether approve of it. In the fifteenth canon of Chalcedon a deaconess is said to be ordained,[8] and to receive laying on of the hand.[9]

IV. Relation of the Laity of a Diocese to their Bishop. We may now consider the position of the laity in the public services of the Church, and their relation to the bishop therein. It has always been recognised that the whole of the Christian brotherhood makes the offering, whether of the Eucharist or of any other prayers and thanksgivings, not only the bishop and his assistant ministers. The brethren, indeed, do not as a rule recite aloud the prayers with the officiant, but this is a matter of convenience, not of theological significance. The practice, taken over by the earliest Christians from the Jews, of saying 'Amen'[1] testifies to the fact that all make the offering; and we may see an example of it in the 'Testament of Our Lord,' in which all the people join with the officiant in saying the Anamnesis at the Eucharist, or part of it, and also in saying a further short prayer later on.[2] The same thing is borne witness to by the people's responses in the litanies and other offices. This is the meaning of what is called the 'priesthood of the laity,'[3] though, as has been pointed out, this is a scarcely adequate term. What is really intended is the common priesthood of all Christian people, whether of the ministry or of the laity. It is not one priesthood of the ministry and an entirely separate priesthood of the laity. As we read in the New Testament, Christians are a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, and a royal priesthood, a holy nation,[4] as the Jews were of old[5]; and Justin Martyr[6] and many other early writers emphasise the above application to Christian worship. It is hardly necessary to say that the doctrine of the priesthood of all Christian people no more negatives the existence of a ministerial priesthood than did the priesthood of all Israel in the Old Covenant. It has no real bearing on the question what the layman may or may not do in Christian worship and in the administration of the sacraments.

---

[1] E.g. *Testament of Our Lord*, i. 45.

[2] *Ep. can. tertia*, ccxvii. 5, fourth century.

[3] *ἐν βαθμῷ.*

[4] So the Ethiopic version of Hippolytus, *Ap. Trad.* (the Latin is defective here), and *Testament of Our Lord*, i. 41, 44 f., expressly of readers, and apparently the Egyptian (Sahidic) canons based on the *Apost. Const.* (see the present writer's *Ancient Church Orders*, p. 23) : this seems to be the meaning of not ' ordaining ' in these cases.

[5] viii. 19 ff.

[6] Funk, ii. 72 ff.

[7] *οὐδὲ γὰρ χειροθετεῖται,* Funk, ii. 82.

[8] *χειροτονεῖσθαι.*

[9] *χειροθεσία.*

Laymen preaching. Among the Jews in New Testament times anyone, it appears, might be invited to speak to those assembled for synagogue worship, not only the officials of the synagogue. Our Lord was invited to read and expound at Nazareth,[7] Paul and Barnabas to speak at Antioch of Pisidia.[8] And, apparently, anyone who had charismata might speak in the Christian assembly.[9] But in early Christian history, at any rate after New Testament times, it was a very rare thing for a layman to preach. It has been suggested that it may be gathered from the language used that the Ancient Homily referred to above (III) was preached by a layman.[1] A famous example of a layman preaching was when Origen, then not yet a presbyter, was invited by the bishop at Caesarea to preach there ; it was not the custom for a layman to do so at Alexandria, but the Palestinian bishops quoted several instances of this happening in their country.[2] In the ' Apostolic Constitutions ' [3] the layman preaching is probably not a public preacher. In the ' Gallican Statutes ' [4] it is said that a layman is not to teach in the presence of the clergy, except at their command, and that a woman, however learned or holy, is not to teach in an assembly of men. This last prohibition, based on 1 Cor. xiv. 34 and 1 Tim. ii. 12, is found in several places. Tertullian [5] says that a woman is not to speak in the church or teach or baptize or offer (the Eucharist). Even the ' Testament of Our Lord,' which magnifies the office of ' women-presidents,' says that they are to instruct women in private, but to be silent in church.[6] The ' Apostolic Constitutions,' [7] in a passage based on the ' Older Didascalia,' say that women are not allowed to teach in church.[8] They are only to pray and listen to the teachers ; our Lord did not commission women to preach.[9]

---

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 16, 'the Amen'; Justin, *Apol.* i. 65.

[2] i. 23 (see above, III.). In the East Syrian liturgies the priest is directed to say several sentences twice, and this is probably a relic of the same thing.

[3] *Sacerdotium laici*, Jerome, *c. Lucif.* 4.

[4] 1 Peter ii. 5, 9; Rev. i. 6.

[5] Exod. xix. 6.

[6] *Dial.* 116 f. See several other instances in the present writer's article 'Laity,' in Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vii. 767.

[7] Luke iv. 16 ff.

[8] Acts xiii. 18 ff.

[9] 1 Cor. xii. 8 ff.; xiv. 1 ff.

At a later date, A.D. 692, the Trullan Council forbad public preaching by laymen in religious services.[10]

The Laity and Baptism. The Apostles, it appears, did not ordinarily themselves baptize ; at any rate St. Paul did not do so at Corinth.[11] In the Acts St. Peter *commanded* Cornelius and his party to be baptized,[12] and it is not said who baptized them. The same uncertainty exists as to the three thousand baptized on an earlier occasion.[13]

But in after years, when the Christian ministry was fully organised, the question often arose whether a layman can baptize in cases of necessity, when a bishop, presbyter, or deacon cannot be had. Writing late in the second century, Tertullian [1] says that laymen have the right to baptize, 'for what is equally received can be equally given'—though the last sentence is of very doubtful truth. The Council of Elvira says [2] that a layman who has not lapsed, and is not a bigamist, may baptize in cases of necessity, but not confirm. The well-known story [3] of the boy Athanasius baptizing in play, and of his bishop not allowing rebaptism in that case, tends to show that lay baptism was not uncommon, whatever we may think of the matter from the point of view of 'intention.' Jerome says that it was lawful and not unusual.[4] Augustine [5] and Isidore of Seville [6] rather doubtfully say the same thing.

---

[1] § 17. So Harnack. But Lightfoot thinks this improbable (*Clement*, ii. 195).

[2] Eusebius, *H.E.* vi. 19.

[3] viii. 32 s.f.

[4] Stat. 98, 99.

[5] *de Virg. Vel.* 9.

[6] i. 40.

[7] iii. 6.

[8] The *Older Didascalia* omits ' in church,' and the words that follow ' to pray,' Funk, i. 190.

[9] *τὸ κήρυγμα.*

[10] Can. 64.

[11] 1 Cor. i. 14 ff.

[12] Acts x. 48.

[13] Acts ii. 42.

On the other hand, the 'Apostolic Constitutions' [7] forbid the laity, and even deacons and those in Minor Orders, to baptize. And the 'Ethiopic Didascalia' [8] also negatives all lay baptism; in the case of women it says, like the 'Older Didascalia,' [9] that if it were lawful for women to baptize, our Lord would have been baptized by his mother. Baptism by women is also forbidden by Tertullian [10] and in the 'Gallican Statutes.' [11]

The Laity and the Consecration of the Eucharist. The Council of Nicaea [12] expressly says that deacons cannot offer the Eucharist; still less, therefore, would it have allowed the laity to do so. The same thing is seen in the 'Apostolic Constitutions.' [13] To go back further, it is instructive that before Tertullian's secession to Montanism, he speaks [14] of the confusion in heretical sects of the relative position of the laity and of the priesthood; to-day one is a deacon who to-morrow is a reader; to-day one is a presbyter who to-morrow is a layman; for even on laymen do they impose the functions of priesthood. But after his secession he allows[1] a layman to offer (the Eucharist) in cases of necessity, because all laymen are priests. It might be thought that in a matter of this sort Montanists revived or retained an old custom which the Church had dropped ; but whatever Montanism was, it did not profess to be conservative.[2] As a matter of fact, no real instance has been found of a layman, outside the heretical sects, being allowed to celebrate the Eucharist, even in an emergency. As to those outside, Firmillian of Cappadocia, writing to Cyprian in the third century, gives an example[3] ; he speaks of a woman pretending to celebrate the Eucharist ‘ with an invocation not to be despised,’ and baptizing many.

---

[1] *de Bapt.* 17; written before his secession.

[2] Can. 38; *c.* A.D. 305.

[3] Rufinus, *H.E.* i. 14; Socrates, *H.E.* i. 15; Sozomen, *H.E.* ii. 17.

[4] *c. Lucif.* 9.

[5] *c. Ep. Parmen.* II. xiii. [29].

[6] *de Eccl. Off.* ii. 25; early seventh century.

[7] iii. 9–11; viii. 28, 46.

[8] § 15 f.

[9] Funk, i. 200.

[10] *de Bapt.* 7.

[11] Stat. 100.

[12] Can. 18: *τοὺς ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἔχοντας προσφέρειν.*

[13] viii. 46.

[14] *de Praescr.* 41.

This essay may be concluded with the words of the author of the ‘ Apostolic Constitutions,’ who ends his work with an eloquent appeal for order,[4] urging that Christians should not exceed their bounds,[5] and adducing many examples from the Old Testament. As nature has its good order, so must the Church, in the distinctions of the ministry, and in the difference between clergy and laity. In another chapter[6] he says that it is good and acceptable before God that each be honoured according to his own dignity ; for the Church is the school, not of disorder,[7] but of good order.[8]

---

[1] *de Exhort. Cast.* 7.

[2] Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, Appended Note H.

[3] Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxiv. (lxxv.) 10.

[4] *τάξις* ; viii. 46.

[5] *ὅρους.*

[6] viii. 31.

[7] *ἀταξία.*

[8] *εὐταξία.*

III

THE MEDIAEVAL BISHOP

By Claude Jenkins

When he was consecrated bishop he gave himself with even greater zeal and fervour to the preaching of the word of God, not in one region only but wherever he was asked. If gainsayers reported his words to their leaders and these endeavoured to refute him he received the replies and with patience and gentleness, as one who was ' working with fear and trembling the salvation ' of all, showed how little weight attached to their arguments and how true and plain is that which the faith of the Church of God holds and teaches. With the spread of divine teaching men began to seek ordination in that Church, living under him and in his company a life under rule. Day by day the truth of the preaching of the Catholic Church, the earnestness, continence and deep poverty of these holy servants of God became better known. The peace and unity of the Church yearned for bishops and clergy from the monastery which owed its existence and its growth to this memorable man and received them as many examples showed. So in succession new churches were planted, new monasteries founded, fit men raised up for the sacerdotal office. By his writings in the original and in translations the teaching of the faith, hope and charity of the Church was spread abroad, not only in his own country but in other lands. Through him day by day was increased and multiplied the unity of peace and the brotherhood of the Church of God, and it was granted him even in his own lifetime to see the fruit of his labours.

He was ever ready to give himself to the settlement of disputes when appealed to, whether by Christians or heretics, and never grudged the time even if, as sometimes happened, he had as a result to go all day without food. His one aim was to secure from all who came to him the obedience and Christian devotion which is due both to God and men. He rebuked sinners with boldness that all might fear, preached the word in season and out of season, and gave special care to instruct those who seemed fitted in their turn to teach others. He was not very ready to address petitions to the secular authorities, even when strongly pressed, but when he did so showed such honesty and moderation as not only to avoid the appearance of being troublesome or vexatious, but to excite admiration. He was assiduous in attendance at councils of bishops, but sought in them not his own interests but the things which are Christ's, viz. the preservation of the faith of the Holy Catholic Church and the maintenance of discipline for bishops and clergy, and in the ordination of these he held that the general consent of Christians and the custom of the Church should be followed.

In clothes and shoes and furnishings he sought to avoid both meanness and display. His table was frugal and abstemious but with flesh food sometimes added to the vegetable fare for the sake of guests or weaker brethren and he always had wine, following in this respect as in others the Apostolic injunction. His spoons only were of silver, the other vessels and dishes being either of earthenware or wood or marble, not because of necessity but because he wished it to be so. He always showed hospitality, and at the table cared more for reading and discussion than for eating and drinking, checking with the utmost sternness any tendency to idle or ill-natured talk. He was ever mindful of those whose poverty he shared and ministered to their needs from the same source as supplied his own wants and those of all who lived with him, that is, either from the revenues of the Church's possessions or the offerings of the faithful. When, as usually happens, the clergy were attacked on the score of their possessions he addressed the people and said that he would rather live on the contributions of God's people than endure the care or management of those possessions: he was quite willing to hand them over so that all the servants and ministers of God might live in the way spoken of in the Old Testament—'serving the altar and being joint partakers with it.' But the laity were never willing to undertake the management.

The care of the Church and all its substance he delegated and entrusted to suitable clergy, retaining nothing whatever in his own hand but seeing that a proper inventory and accounts were kept with a yearly audit of receipts and expenses. At the same time in many respects he relied more on the good faith of the steward of his house than on strict account. He was never willing to buy any real property, but if anything were given or bequeathed to the Church he ordered it to be accepted unless the legacies were made at the expense of the testator's kindred. He insisted that it was better in every way for the Church to accept legacies than to seek for inheritances, and for himself he chose the part of Mary rather than that of Martha. If the Church were in want of money he announced to the Christian people that he had not wherewithal to supply the needs of the poor. For the ransom of prisoners and relief of a distressed multitude he even ordered the sacred vessels to be broken up and melted down. The Bishop and his clergy themselves lived together, had a common table and a common purse for all expenses of food and raiment. All alike, inmates and guests, had a fixed portion of drink assigned to them and infractions of rules of discipline were punished by appropriate deprivation. No woman was ever allowed to stay in his house, even though she were the Bishop's sister or a relation of one of the members, neither did the Bishop ever grant interviews to women except in the presence of clergy, nor save in cases of urgent necessity visit monasteries of women. While he visited the orphans and widows in their affliction as the Apostle enjoins and was ready without delay to go to pray and to lay hands upon the sick if asked to do so, he resolutely refused to accept invitations to festive gatherings in his own country lest from their frequency the limit of moderation should be lost.

It is just 1500 years since the death of Augustine of Hippo and nearly as long since his most intimate friend, Possidius, Bishop of Calama, penned the life-like description of which an imperfect summary has been given above. Whether Augustine himself belonged to the Middle Ages which he so greatly influenced or represents the close of an earlier era may be disputed, but there are many features of this description which make it useful for our present purpose both by way of parallel and of contrast. It may be convenient to deal with them first in outline in relation to the Bishop, his cathedral and diocese, and his relations with his brother bishops, reserving to a later stage the treatment of those aspects of each which belong more particularly to the later part of the Middle Ages, and with special reference to English conditions.

There is something more than the preoccupation or partiality of the biographer in the central position assigned by Bishop Possidius to Augustine as bishop. And this fact is of the greater importance because it is not the dignity of his see, nor social prestige, nor wealth, nor political influence in secular affairs which gives him the position. Those things, which were the snare of the typical mediaeval bishop, and as embodied in all that is commonly understood by ‘ prelacy ’ and continued down to the early part of the Nineteenth century are the ground of much of the modern prejudice against episcopacy, Augustine neither had nor desired to possess. Nor is it even his personal popularity. He is the centre of everything because he is the Sacerdos, the Sacerdos cum clericis, the Bishop with his clergy, but himself the Chief Preacher, the Chief Pastor, the Judge among his brethren and Arbiter of disputes among those without, the Chief Organiser, the centre of the ‘ unitas pacis ’ and of the ‘ fraternitas ecclesiae.’ He has the Ignatian position, though Possidius, in what Bishop Robertson has well called his ‘ admirably simple and graphic life,’ does not use the Ignatian language which would probably have been no more natural to him than it is to most Western minds. He is an apostolic man, guided in conduct and practice by his interpretation of apostolic maxims.

Mediaeval history contains many examples of bishops and abbots who are said to have ‘postponed the care of Martha to that of Mary,’ but such men are seldom credited with efficient administration. Augustine, however, seems to have known how to get the best out of other people, and that the indispensable condition of successful delegation is confidence. The separate organisation of the management of his ‘Church’ and of his ‘household,’ a system which in later times led to conflict, often of an embittered kind, between the interests of the cathedral body and those of the Bishop and his officials, was perhaps safeguarded by the fact that while we hear of a ‘praepositus domus’ we do not hear of a ‘praepositus ecclesiae,’ though when Augustine himself had been raised by the wishes of the people from the status of a layman to that of ‘presbyter’ of the Church of Hippo, Bishop Valerius, who ordained him, had given him unusual powers in that position. In any case as bishop, Augustine himself kept the ultimate control of everything in his own hands. It will be observed that the revenues of the estates of the Church and the oblations of the faithful are regarded as one common stock, drawn upon alike by the Bishop and his clergy for themselves and by the Bishop for the benefit of his ‘compauperes’—that is, of all who were in need of help. Economically the arrangement may seem to some to be as much open to criticism as the acceptance of the position that a house-steward may be treated as satisfactory if believed to be trustworthy, even though he is a poor accountant. The exercise by the Bishop of a direct pastoral care is as noticeable as the assiduity with which he performs judicial functions guided by the principles of the New Testament and, if so ambiguous a term may be pardoned, by common sense rather than by the more precise regulations of a code. We should infer that a very wide discretion was regarded as inherent in his office, but the reference to the business of councils of bishops shows that in Augustine's view they ought to act in concert in the treatment of disciplinary questions. Nor was he, of course, singular in this in any age of the Church, and more than 600 years later we find St. Peter Damiani repeating a story that St. Martin of Tours did not attend a single bishops' meeting for fifteen years, and saying that this may be regarded as in some sense a resignation of episcopal functions.

The advantage of the system as organised by Augustine was, as his biographer points out, that the Bishop was set free for the most important matters of spiritual concern. The danger of it as seen in the fully developed mediaeval system is two-fold : (*a*) in relation to the Bishop himself, (*b*) in regard to the excessive organisation of the system of delegation. We may deal with the latter first. The term ' bureaucracy ' is less than a century old, but it stands for something which is a product of the human mind in all ages at a certain stage of civilisation and it fails from its own perfection because it is governed by mechanical not by biological concepts. The perfection of the machine is a perfection strictly limited and conditional. We pay it its highest praise if we say that it is almost human, forgetting on the one hand that it is often far more efficient than any human being can ever hope to be, on the other that in the ' almost ' a great gulf is still implied. And of all forms of government an ecclesiastical bureaucracy is the most dangerous because it presents an attempt to confine the operation of the Divine Spirit within a human construction which itself becomes de-humanised in the process.

Schematically regarded, the mediaeval ecclesiastical system, as seen in Western Europe, had much to recommend it. At the apex was the Bishop of Rome, the occupant of a see which enjoyed always during the period in theory and sometimes in fact a ' potentior principalitas ' in a sense which would possibly have startled St. Irenaeus. It is true that it was but slowly that the Pope came to regard himself or to be regarded by others as fountain of Jurisdiction and Law, if not of Order, but no other voice in Western Europe could claim to speak with like authority and even when that authority was challenged neither an Emperor like Henry III nor a Bishop like Robert Grosseteste failed to distinguish between the office and its holder. The Pope was elected by the body of cardinals, but once Pope he was regarded by no one as simply *primus inter pares* among their number. The grant by him of the pallium, originally a mark of honour without further significance, became restricted to metropolitans and with the insistence from the eleventh century onwards that it must be applied for in person came the opportunity of representing the possession of it as requisite for the execution of the office, of binding the holder by the oath taken before its reception with the most solemn obligation of obedience, and finally, as the papal lawyers advanced even larger claims of jurisdiction, of depriving the candidate not merely of metropolitical but even of diocesan jurisdiction until he had complied with the requirements. Compared with these encroachments in the spiritual sphere, efforts at temporal aggrandisement are of minor importance, though they excited more feeling and evoked greater opposition. The spiritual nexus of Pope, metropolitan and diocesan bishop gave an additional force and importance to 'canonical sanctions,' and the system of law administered in the Curia Romana regarded simply as a system had merits which may easily be underestimated in comparison with other systems. Canons might be discordant, but under skilful if unofficial handling, with some allowance of legal fiction, much might be and was done. Moreover it had in it the capacity both for adaptation and growth. And so far as practice is concerned it must be remembered that Law is no more truly discredited than Medicine or Theology because it presents unexpected pitfalls to the presumptuous or the unwary. For the rest there were possibly other bishops besides Trefnant of Hereford, who had the right to reflect with a just pride that they could draw a case or pleading in curial form as well as any advocate practising in the Papal Court.

In subordination to the diocesan bishop was a minor hierarchy of persons, each with appropriate functions and arranged in gradations of a fairly uniform scale, which the notary recognised by a nice discrimination of adjectives. The Archdeacon and the Chancellor and Commissary, if such were had, would in most cases have received at least some practical training in law. Each would represent the bishop in whose name he acted in respect of some portion of his functions, and each, if lawfully empowered thereto, might, and the Archdeacon certainly did, appoint an official or a surrogate to act for him in the dispatch of business in case he should be absent or otherwise hindered from personal discharge of his functions. An Archdeacon of Canterbury, like Petrus Rogeri, or that other Peter who was Archdeacon of Rochester, could thus combine the emoluments of the office with those of a Cardinal at the Roman Curia. Save where as at Norwich the Archdeacon's court enjoyed for certain purposes co-ordinate jurisdiction the Bishop's Court presided over by Chancellor or Commissionary general, was the superior court to which appeals might be brought on the way either to the court of the province or with a direct appeal to Rome. In even closer contact with the clergy were the rural deans with their chapters and for certain purposes their courts. For the administration of spiritual discipline *in foro conscientiae* there would be the bishop's penitentiary, and many minor functions would be discharged by the bishop's *clerici familiares*, a modest class of men who preserved illusions and sometimes cherished them and in any case saved many situations. The head of the cathedral chapter, whether prior or dean, according as the foundation was monastic or secular, was a man with whom the bishop was brought into frequent relations in matters of business and of whose services he often availed himself even for extraneous concerns. Nor would there be wanting secular officials—seneschal, steward or bailiff of the bishop's manors, officers of the household. In ordinary circumstances we shall expect to find some four or five of these various officials normally in attendance on the bishop within the diocese, and acting as a sort of council whose advice he seeks in the conduct of affairs and whose presence may be detected sometimes by express mention as his council, often by the list of witnesses attesting his acts. And always there will be, or ought to be, the registrar or scribe of those acts, a notary by apostolic or by apostolic and imperial authority, the man who knows the forms and the way in which things ought to be done. As a set off to the criticisms to which, in later ages, his omissions have sometimes exposed him must be remembered the evidence, to those who have eyes to see, of almost pathetic attempts sometimes to keep up with the mass of work, with gaps left for opportunities which never came, or now and again a note that Reverendissimus has been performing official acts in his absence, and that no one having kept a proper note of what had been done, the registrar has had to make the best entries that he could. Nor again would the task be made easier if the bishop being absent *in remotis*, whether in attendance on the king or engaged in the business of state, or hindered by grave sickness, or paying a triennial visit *ad limina Apostolorum*, has appointed a vicar or vicars general in spirituals to act for him, and their acts which ought to have been returned for entry, or at least for preservation, have gone astray or proved too bulky for immediate treatment.

Perfectly administered by a devoted band of subordinates under the supervision of a shrewd but sympathetic bishop, such a system might succeed; but success, however judged, required the combination of many circumstances not readily to be secured. The devout rusticity which Bishop Otto of Bamberg admired in style as the friend of truth was not to be found in any aspect in the rural deans, whose 'luciferiana versutia' is censured by Archbishop Pecham in 1281. And here we may put two pictures side by side. The first is this which is limned in the twelfth of Pecham's Constitutions of that year: 'Some rural deans are defamed for diabolical craft in citations contrary to the common order of law; that is, they sell certificates for money to fraudulent men, when no notice of the citation is given to the party concerned, either before making the certificate or afterwards, and so the innocent is condemned,' or again in the thirteenth, where illegitimate use of the dean's seal is obtained by the 'wages of unrighteousness,' or in the fourteenth, where clandestine inquests held by deans deprive holders of benefices of their rights. The other is taken from a letter of Samuel Wilberforce as Bishop of Oxford to a friend (Feb. 16, 1846): 'I hope to secure your services to my diocese in the capacity of Rural Dean. My desire is that the Rural Dean should carry out through the district committed to his charge that effective parochial supervision and inspection, which the size of our dioceses makes impossible for the Bishop, or even for the Archdeacon. I wish that he should keep me accurately informed of the spiritual details of his parishes, that he should visit annually all his churches, and that he should be a centre of spiritual influence to the clergy. This he may be, if God gives him grace to be at once active, orderly, and prudent.' It would be absurd to say either that all thirteenth-century rural deans were obnoxious to Archbishop Pecham's censures or that all those of the nineteenth achieved the standard indicated by Bishop Wilberforce. Nor can any reader of mediaeval constitutions and canons say that the ecclesiastical authorities generally showed themselves either ignorant of the existence of scandals or careless of remedy. But after all it is the sufferers who are most acutely conscious of the incidence of abuses, and if they found themselves enmeshed in a great legal web from which they could only extricate themselves with difficulty, it is scarcely surprising if they regarded with passionate hatred alike the system and those responsible for its development and enforcement by spiritual censures, which were themselves degraded by being turned to unworthy uses as instruments for the collection of fees due to officials.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the indebtedness of the mediaeval state to the mediaeval ecclesiastic, but no one would venture to contend that the contribution was made without loss of spiritual efficiency. And in the case of a bishop that loss was the most serious in proportion to his spiritual responsibility. How could he fulfil the solemn obligation to be 'semper in divinis negotiis mancipatus, et a terrenis negotiis vel lucris turpibus alienus' if the greater part of his time were given to secular concerns, or fulfil the duties 'judicare, interpretari, consecrare, ordinare, offerre, baptizare et confirmare'? There were great men in England among the episcopal Chancellors and Treasurers of the fourteenth century and the study of the registers of their episcopal acts, where these registers survive, does not warrant a wholly unfavourable verdict; nor does the wave of anti-clericalism, which undoubtedly rose high, take its origin primarily from unfavourable judgments of the way in which they performed those functions which were specifically episcopal. And the students of the Middle Ages can think of many bishops in whose case the attribution of ‘ reverenda paternitas ’ is something more than the politeness of a legal secretary. No one expected the mediaeval bishop to perform the duties which properly belong to the parish priest, and few would have quarrelled with the Ignatian maxim, had they known it, that a bishop is to be honoured in proportion to his silence. The reasons which made him a great person in the life of his diocese, indeed its central figure, may be judged in some measure by anyone who reads the records of the Visitations of Odo Rigaldi, Archbishop of Rouen, or of Godfrey Giffard, Bishop of Worcester.

We have spoken of the fully developed mediaeval system and of the ordered series of relationships which it implied. But it must not be assumed to have been disorderly in an earlier period because it was slow in reaching its final form. Of this the facts collected in Fr. Puller's valuable essay on ‘ The Spiritual Jurisdiction of Bishops in the Church at large and in the Church of England ’ might suffice to convince even those who disagreed with some or all of the writer's inferences. Strictly interpreted, the statement that ‘ neither during the four hundred years which immediately preceded the Norman Conquest, nor for nearly a hundred years after it, did the English Church recognize in the Pope any right to meddle with the appointment of her Bishops or even of her Archbishops ’ may seem ambiguous or to go too far. But that would not detract from the importance of the observation that ‘ between 669 and 1050 there were consecrated in England 376 bishops, but during the whole of that period there was not one single case in which the Pope had any share either in the appointment or in the consecration.’ The number and the statement are alike remarkable, but Professor J. P. Whitney in a very interesting paper at the Gloucester Church Congress (1928) stated that he had verified them for himself. Moreover, the obligation of profession of obedience to the Pope which Gregory VII and Gregory IX fastened first upon some, then upon all metropolitans, was not extended to all bishops until the time of Martin V. And the fifteenth-century scribe who wrote in the margin of Arundel's register at Lambeth against an entry of a fourteenth-century bull recognizing the Archbishop's confirmation of the election of a Bishop of London, ‘Nota bene antiquam libertatem Cantuariensis Ecclesiae,’ probably felt more than an antiquarian interest in the subject.

For the middle of the thirteenth century the priceless little tract of Laurence of Somercote, canon of Chichester, on ‘The Election of Bishops,’ which the student may read either in Bradshaw and Wordsworth's ‘Lincoln Cathedral Statutes’ (1897), or the critical edition published at Weimar in 1907 by Professor Alfred von Wretschko of Innsbruck, affords a most interesting study. St. Richard of Wyche, Bishop of Chichester (1244–53) has died. His death has deprived his church of ‘the solace of a Pastor’ and Geoffrey the dean and the canons after the funeral signify their loss to the King with request for leave to elect a successor. This is granted by letters patent, and the canons are summoned to meet, those who are unable to attend being allowed to nominate another of their number to act on their behalf. Laurence goes on to sketch procedure. On the day of meeting after a Mass of the Holy Spirit, the hymn ‘Veni Creator Spiritus’ is sung, followed by the prayer ‘Deus qui corda fidelium’ and then the chapter go apart by themselves. An address appropriate to the occasion is given by the Dean or one of their number, the letters of absent canons are read and also Innocent III's constitution ‘Quia propter,’ which since the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) had governed elections. There are four possible modes of election, (i) by inspiration, (ii) by compromission, (iii) by scrutiny, (iv) by postulation; but, whichever way is followed, Laurence is urgent that the consent of the elect must not be required beforehand. After election the elect is asked to consent and during the singing of ‘Te Deum Laudamus’ is conducted to the high altar, where he prostrates himself. The election is then published to the assembled clergy and laity and formal documents are drawn up, (*a*) one to be sent by the elect and some of the canons to the King asking for his assent; this must be done before the Archbishop is approached for confirmation; (*b*) a letter of procuration for the prosecution of the business of the election before the Archbishop; (*c*) the ‘decree of election’ subscribed by all the canons present with a note of the consent of those who have authorized another to sign for them. Application to King and Archbishop is made by the elect in person, furnished with the letters mentioned above. In the case of ' postulation,' where a person is desired who is otherwise ineligible for certain specified reasons, application has to be made by the chapter to the King to approve and to send his letters to the Pope on behalf of the elect, and also by the chapter to the Pope asking that the elect may be provided as bishop. As Laurence is ' Domini Papae subdiaconus ' we may assume that he knows what is proper, and neither the suggested letter to the Pope nor the decree of postulation makes any mention of the fact that the special consent of the King has been asked, but neither in the former case is there any mention of the royal assent in the letter to the Archbishop. Laurence's purpose is a limited one and it does not fall within his intention to discuss such matters as the procedure of the confirmation so elaborately organized or as consecration and enthronement, the Bishop's profession of obedience to the Archbishop and homage to the King, or the point at which either should be made. Certainly the new Bishop might not have the spiritualities restored to him without the former, nor the temporalities without the latter. And at any stage there would be fees to be paid for which justification would be alleged on grounds either of custom or of right or of both, and for which the blame, so far as they are properly regarded as abuses, is attributable at least as much to mediaeval conceptions of the economics of administration as to the rapacity of individuals.

It is probable that we often allow too little weight to economic considerations in our judgement of mediaeval conditions and mediaeval persons. The mediaeval bishop was not simply taking a holiday or seeking change of scene when he moved from one manor to another; even a cumbrous way of supporting himself and his household might prove in the end the easiest in view of the contemporary method of organizing supplies. When he went on a formal visitation a new set of problems arose, as we shall see. Indeed, few departments of episcopal activity illustrate more vividly the difference between mediaeval and modern conditions than that of visitation. If the mediaeval bishop or archbishop said a great deal less and did a great deal more than his later successors, as is undoubtedly the case, that is not a ground in itself for disparaging comparisons. For them a visitation was not only an obligation of pastoral care : it was a vindication of jurisdiction and a very definite exercise of its functions. It began with the suspension of all subordinate jurisdictions and its legal aspect was brought out by every document connected with it as well as by the inevitable exaction of fees, or at least the attempt to exact them. For the exhibition of 'paternal solicitude' and the opportunity of personal contact with the Bishop these might not seem a wholly unreasonable return, but it was another matter when the solicitude was exercised by deputy and the resultant advantage less clearly evident than the disturbance of routine. The number of persons accompanying the Bishop was not mere ostentation, nor did he always insist on his full rights in this respect, especially when a burden might have been imposed upon those visited which they would have been ill able to bear. Yet it is undeniable that many cases of friction arose both where visitatorial rights were admitted and where they were challenged. Such a challenge could only be successfully sustained on the ground of some special or general exemption such as might have resulted from the efforts of monastic bodies, increasingly evident from the eleventh century onwards, to escape from diocesan control. The later student owes much to the 'comperta et detecta' of visitations and the injunctions which followed, while to the Bishop the procedure afforded an invaluable opportunity of judging of the state of his clergy and diocese, of inculcating and, if need be, enforcing reforms, and its effects were salutary in intention if not always, as we should judge, successful in practice. In any case the moral value of an inspection of this kind was considerable, even if the actual results proved but transitory and the favourable anticipations suggested by the theme of the opening sermon were found not to have been justified. When subjected to careful scrutiny the answers to the visitation articles often yield invaluable results, but the scrutiny is necessary, for allowance has to be made for a tendency natural to certain temperaments to return too readily the answer ‘ Omnia bene.’

Assuming that the Bishop could establish the jurisdiction that he claimed no one disputed his right to set in order things that visitation disclosed to be amiss in each particular case. But it was possible also for him to promulge in his diocesan synod ordinances of a more general application for the well-governing of clergy and people in the same way that archiepiscopal constitutions were promulged in the provincial synod. There was probably less of autocracy about such a proceeding in either case than might at first appear, just as in an election where one person acting on behalf of the whole body says ‘ Eligo,’ not ‘ eligimus,’ no one supposes that what is expressed is merely an individual suffrage. If in practice the number of persons actually consulted was limited, that was due at least in part to the conditions of the time. It is clear that beneficed clergy and, at least in some cases, heads of monastic houses, could be compelled to attend an annual diocesan synod. But it will not follow that such synods were always held or that when they were held excuses for non-attendance were never admitted. Strictly speaking, the synod was a meeting of the Bishop and priests and the fact that deacons and laymen could in certain circumstances be present does not imply that they had any right to take part in deliberations, nor any responsibility for decisions by which they might nevertheless be bound. The mediaeval chronicler at any rate had no doubt that the injunctions put forth in synods by St. Hugh of Lincoln applied not only to the ‘ universus clerus,’ but also to the ‘ populus ’ of the diocese, though with most of them the clergy are of course primarily concerned.

It is never quite easy to say to what extent a Bishop shared or was bound to share his responsibility with others. For example, in his use of the *Jus liturgicum*, if like John de Grandisson of Exeter he were at all competent, his efforts would be welcomed, and in any case would have been fruitless unless they had been received with goodwill. The registers give evidence of a good many cases in which special prayers and services are enjoined for special needs or occasions and the form of service is indicated. But it will be observed that the lines followed are for the most part traditional and the prayers enjoined do not go outside the limits as a rule of what was already familiar through long usage. We may have a shrewd suspicion that Quignon in the sixteenth century suggested to Pope Clement VII that he should be allowed to undertake a reformation of the Breviary ; in any case it was under papal patronage that he undertook it and also not without the assistance of 'members of his household instructed in sacred literature and canon law and learned in Latin and Greek.' It would scarcely have occurred to the mind of a mediaeval bishop that inherent in his office was a right to do anything that he pleased in regard to the traditional forms of the services of the Church, even though in practice he felt himself at liberty at times to follow the same principles as Gregory the Great, according to Bede, had commended to Augustine.

Mediaeval conditions made visits of English diocesan bishops to their brethren in other dioceses a serious undertaking, and therefore comparatively infrequent. On the other hand the obligations of their position in respect of duties in Parliament and Convocation, as well as the secular duties which some of them fulfilled, made an 'inn,' a residence in London, for many of them something more than a luxury ; and possibilities of common intercourse and of conference at Lambeth and elsewhere were thereby increased. For those who found themselves unable to attend when summoned by the Archbishop through the Dean of the Province to a formal assembly, proxies were allowed unless they were expressly excluded, and a common share in responsibility was thus emphasized just as it was in the Archbishop's notification to the bishops of the province enjoining attendance at the consecration of a new bishop or the sending of letters of agreement by those unable to be present.

Normally the predominance of the metropolitan over his suffragans was sufficient to secure a uniform policy whether in matters of spiritual concern or in relation to the answer to be returned to requests for money grants for royal or papal needs, nay rather for the defence of the realm itself from its enemies, or for the stability of the whole Church, as the case might be, influences which did not always produce quite so considerable a result as their ostensible gravity might seem to demand. But the balance might be upset either by the secular eminence of one or more of the number or by such anomalies as those created by the appointment of Henry Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester, both as Cardinal priest of St. Eusebius and as legate a latere in England, where the exercise of his functions was not obtained without difficulty. Even the position of Beaufort was less anomalous than that of Wolsey, and its consequences were less strange. But the counterpart is seen from one point of view in the remarkable arrangement which forms the subject of one of Bishop Creighton's 'Historical Essays and Addresses,' that relating to 'The Italian Bishops of Worcester.' Whatever may be said of Beaufort or of Wolsey as Papal representatives they were at any rate Englishmen. The revenues of the see of Worcester were for forty years before the Reformation 'deliberately set apart for the payment of a diplomatic agent at the Roman Court. The agent was chosen for his fitness for the task. He was naturally an Italian, for an Italian was more useful than an Englishman. He was avowedly resident out of England, and permanently discharged his episcopal functions by proxy. The system was set on foot by an agreement between the King and the Pope —an agreement which no doubt seemed natural and obvious to both of them. It illustrates the decay of the spiritual life of the Church, and it illustrates also the great development of diplomacy, which was a marked feature of the sixteenth century.' And as Dr. Creighton is careful also to point out, 'as a matter of history, the appointment of these Italians was due to the English King, and not to the suggestion, still less to the authority, of the Pope. In the fifteenth century the Papacy had little power of interfering in English affairs contrary to the royal will. The Italian Bishops of Worcester were really servants of the King and not of the Pope.' It is noted that the Hereford diocese could shew a parallel in the appointment of Adrian di Castello, afterwards translated to Bath and Wells, and Salisbury in that of Lorenzo Campeggio, and we may add, though he was an Englishman and his diplomatic mission was not to Rome, Bonner's appointment to Hereford. ‘ It would seem that the western part of the Midlands was thought to be best able to dispense with bishops, and Worcester best of all. The reasons, we may be sure, were political rather than spiritual, and probably arose from the improved condition of the Welsh Marches. In earlier times the Bishops of Hereford and Worcester had much work to do in guarding the Marches, and often played an important part in English politics, but their importance gradually dwindled as the organization of the state grew more complete. . . . The revenues of Worcester were large enough to form an ample provision for an ambassador, and the diocese was so well filled with wealthy monasteries that the external dignity of the Church would be well provided for without a bishop.’

Even writ ironically the last sentence lacks something of historical precision, for there is no evidence that the ‘ external dignity of the Church ’ entered into question from whatever point the transaction was viewed, nor was it ever supposed that a diocese could be allowed to go on without provision for the performance of episcopal functions. If a bishop were indeed as Sir Francis North, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, said in 1678, ‘ in the nature of an ecclesiastical sheriff,’ it was only in respect of one side of his functions and that the most readily supplied by deputation. For functions belonging to his Order, if he were unable to perform them in person, recourse must be had, and in general was certainly had, to a neighbouring bishop or to an Irish bishop who found it more convenient to live in England, or to the services as a suffragan of one or other of a class of men consecrated to Eastern sees, which no one expected them to visit, but holding ecclesiastical preferments in English which provided for their maintenance while giving episcopal aid to diocesans. We may well doubt as we look at the list of them and examine their careers so far as they can be followed in episcopal registers and elsewhere, if they deserved in most cases the stricture implied in the fortieth instance of the anonymous tract, sometimes attributed to Wyclif, ‘ How religious men shoulde kepe certayne Articles ’ : ‘ that thei ben not maad bischopis of hethene men and sweren to goo thider and conuerte hem and thanne meynteyned to be saffragans and sellen sacramentis and robben the peple and maken hem haue goddis curs for here money.'

Here, as to a still greater extent in the companion tract which 'Telleth of Prelatis' with its appalling catalogue of the excesses and shortcomings of those that 'leuen not as pore prestis after crist and his apostlis but as lordis' there is the touch of satire and exaggeration which calls for compensation, or a liberal allowance by way of discount, but leaves at the same time a very vivid picture of the circumstances of a mediaeval bishop's life and work. The same kind of impression is left by the study of the sermon literature of the thirteenth century and later, even after the same necessary allowance has been made, and with the reminder that at least some part of the criticism comes from men who were themselves bishops. It would be possible to adduce parallels in England to careers like that of the saintly Bruno of Cologne, whose example Dr. R. L. Poole styles 'a model of the union of the scholar and the statesman. Himself continually occupied with every sort of official business, he always reserved his early morning hours for study. He withdrew from the noisy mirth of the supper-table to find relief in his books, his energies apparently freshened by the labour of the day. Wherever he went he carried about his library with him, as it had been the ark of the Lord. . . . To us looking back at Bruno's work it is difficult to exaggerate its value whether to his nation or to the Church at large. Under his guidance the royal palace became the centre also of intellectual life in Germany. Bruno's aim was to fit the clergy to spread this new civilisation over the country, and when they departed to higher offices afterwards, as when he himself was raised to the see of Cologne, to form each one a fresh centre of learning.' If we wanted a contrast we might set Robert Stretton, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield for 25 years (1360–1385). When he was nominated Bishop owing to the influence of the Black Prince, whose chaplain he was, he was rejected by successive commissions for defect of learning, and when after appointment by papal provision and consecration under commission from Archbishop Islep, who had more than once refused him, he made his profession of obedience to the Archbishop, another had to read the profession since he was unable to do so himself. Even the charitable assumption of defect of vision, which does not cover all the facts, does not remove the feeling that he was a singular choice for the episcopate, and that the selection does credit to none of the parties concerned. But admittedly the moral influence of one or two good choices may enormously exceed that of a large number of bad ones, and it is fairer to judge a system by its successes than by its failures. There were not lacking great bishops in any Christian country during the Middle Ages. In their own time their influence was in part mediated through the conditions under which it was exercised, in part transcended them. It is good mediaevalism to endeavour to understand those conditions and to form a just appreciation of their character. It is neither good mediaevalism nor good sense to ignore defects, to preserve them, or to try to replace a living organism in an environment which its vitality has enabled it to outgrow.

IV

(i) THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION: ENGLAND

By Cyril Forster Garbett, Bishop of Southwark

No attempt will be made in this essay to give the history of episcopacy in England; its purpose is to describe episcopacy as it actually exists to-day in the provinces of Canterbury and York, with special reference to characteristic differences from other parts of the Anglican Communion. As this volume may be read by some who belong to overseas Churches, it will occasionally be necessary to state what is known to most English Churchmen and to give some explanation of anomalies and inconsistencies which have behind them the history of centuries. The antiquity of the Church of England and its close association with the State have resulted in the growth of customs and institutions which seem strange and illogical to those who are only familiar with the clear cut constitutions and procedure of provinces which have come into existence in the last two centuries.

Ecclesiastically, England is divided into the two provinces of Canterbury and York, each with an archbishop who presides over its Convocation. There are forty-three dioceses, thirty in the southern province, thirteen in the northern. The archbishops have precedence over all other bishops; they each have their court of appeal; and the bishops make a promise of canonical obedience to the archbishop of their province. In the Middle Ages there was much unseemly controversy between the two archbishops on questions of precedence. But for several centuries this has been recognised as belonging to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

He is the Primate of All England. He crowns and anoints the monarch. He usually represents the Church on occasions of State when a religious service is required. He is the spokesman of the nation on great religious and moral problems. His influence and authority with the diocesan bishops is not the less because it is undefined, and they turn to him frequently for counsel and advice. Lambeth Palace of recent years has been the central house, not only of the province of Canterbury but of the whole Anglican Communion. The archbishop is *primus inter pares* with the moral authority and influence which come from occupying the chair of St. Augustine and from perpetual and close contact with the leaders and the problems of the Church in every part of the world.

In the nature and history of the different dioceses of England there is to be found every possible variety. Some of them are centuries old, and their cathedrals are records in stone of the history of Church and Nation : others are of quite recent origin, with no past and no traditions. Some of them are almost exclusively urban and industrial, with vast populations concentrated in a comparatively small area ; others are rural, with villages and quiet towns scattered amidst the downs or amongst the woods and fields of the country-side. In extent the English diocese is considerably smaller than the overseas diocese, but on the other hand the number of its clergy, parishes and population is far larger. The contrast between the number of clergy in a diocese in England and those under a bishop in other parts of Christendom is remarkable : on an average a bishop has jurisdiction over 49 priests and deacons in South Africa, 57 in New Zealand, 67 in Canada, 238 in Wales, and 399 in England. In England itself there is a great difference between the numbers of the clergy in the different dioceses ; London, Southwark and Lichfield each have 1198, 659 and 622 incumbents and assistant curates ; while Guildford, Bradford and Portsmouth have respectively 220, 190 and 189.

In recent years there has been a strong movement for the division of the ancient dioceses. They were too large for purposes of administration or for a bishop to be known personally to his clergy as a Father-in-God. Since 1876 eighteen new sees have been created, from Truro and St. Albans in 1877 to Derby in 1927. In most of these cases division has been undoubtedly beneficial, so much so that recommendations have been made by a committee appointed by the Church Assembly in favour of the creation of several additional sees. There are, however, at present some signs of a reaction from the policy of forming a large number of small dioceses: experience has shown that it is difficult to find in them sufficient men for the necessary committees and central posts, that they have few ordinands, that they require the same expenditure of time and money for diocesan machinery as in the case of a large diocese. But there is an unanswerable case for the further division of those dioceses which are either so large in extent that it is impossible for the bishop to know his clergy, or for the clergy and laity to come together easily for corporate gatherings in which the diocese as a whole can form and express its mind.

The visitor from overseas is sometimes struck by the size of the English bishop's residence and the apparent largeness of his income. The house which he occupies is often of great historical interest, and for ages has been associated with the history of the see. Lambeth Palace, Fulham Palace, Bishop Auckland, Hartlebury Castle, and Wells, to name only a few, are buildings of national and architectural interest. Often for sentimental reasons there would be widespread regret in the dioceses to which they belong if the ancient episcopal houses were no longer occupied by the holder of the see. But the cost of their maintenance is so heavy that in some cases they have already been abandoned by the bishop: while in the new dioceses houses both smaller and more convenient have been provided. The size of the income depends partly upon local reasons: in no case is it provided by the State; it is paid by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners either from the ancient endowments of the see or from capital sums raised in recent years for the creation of a diocese. In the case of the new dioceses, £3000 is the figure usually regarded as reasonable. Out of this the bishop has to maintain a house far larger than any layman would think of occupying with the same income, he has to provide for chaplain and for secretarial expenses, for the cost of travelling, for frequent hospitality and a household staff sufficient to meet the demands made by a series of visitors, of meetings and by ordination retreats. It has been urged that much misunderstanding would be removed if a division was made between the official and personal portions of the episcopal income, and this has been done in the case of at least two of the new sees. There is no age limit to a bishop's tenure of his see, but under the Episcopal Pensions Measure, 1926, he is entitled to a pension at seventy. For this a deduction is made annually from his official income.

Appointment of Bishops. The fact that the Church of England is established makes the method of the appointment of its bishops different from what is found elsewhere in the Anglican Communion. In most of the dioceses in theory the bishop is elected by the Dean and Chapter on the nomination of the Sovereign ; in practice the Dean and Chapter accept the name which has been recommended to the Sovereign by the Prime Minister. The procedure is as follows. When a vacancy occurs the Dean and Chapter petition the Crown for the right to elect a bishop. A license, known as the *congé d'élire*, is granted, and with it there comes a ' letter missive ' from the Sovereign with the name of the person to be elected. The name has been made public days or even weeks before the meetings of the Dean and Chapter, and on all sides the election is regarded as a certainty. If, however, the Chapter refuses to choose the name which has been sent to it, it incurs the penalties of praemunire, which include the loss of civil rights, forfeiture of lands, goods and chattels, and imprisonment for an indefinite period ; the Sovereign then proceeds to appoint by letters patent. In the case of some of the new dioceses in which there is no Chapter the appointment is directly made by letters patent, though in the most recently created dioceses the election is made as above by the provisional Chapter.

When the election has been made it must be confirmed by the archbishop of the province or by his vicar-general. At this ceremony the bishop elect assents to his appointment, and after taking the oaths and making the usual declarations is declared formally to be elected. Attempts have been made to use this occasion as an opportunity of objecting on doctrinal or personal grounds to the person who has been elected. But these have always been unsuccessful, and it has been ruled that the only objection which could be entertained was one that urged that 'the election in some manner or form has been defective, or that the person presented is not the person on whom the choice of the Crown has fallen.'[1] After the confirmation—in the case of one who is not a bishop—it remains for the archbishop to consecrate with the assistance of at least two other bishops. When the appointment has been made direct by letters patent confirmation is dispensed with and the oaths and declarations are made before the consecration. The appointment of the bishop is thus in effect made by the Prime Minister. The letters of Queen Victoria show what a close personal interest the monarch can take in the selection and the influence which can be exercised in a strictly constitutional way by the Crown. Moreover, the Prime Minister usually takes advice from others before the recommendation is made to the Sovereign. A succession of Prime Ministers in modern times have taken care and trouble in fulfilling this responsibility. Mr. Lloyd George, when Prime Minister, thus describes his practice in a letter, dated February 21, 1920, to the Archbishop of Canterbury: 'Certainly in this case of Diocesan Bishoprics my recommendations to His Majesty have only been made after careful and anxious consultation with yourself, and in the case of sees in the Northern Province with the Archbishop of York also. It is also within your knowledge that I have in regard to all higher appointments taken the further step of seeking the opinion of a number of prominent Churchmen representing all shades of opinion.'[2] Nor must it be forgotten that in the case of an appointment which would clearly bring scandal on the Church, the Chapter and the archbishop could brave all penalties, and in the one case refuse to elect and in the other refuse to consecrate. But for all practical purposes, according to modern constitutional usage, the choice of a diocesan bishop rests with the Prime Minister of the day, who may be neither a Churchman nor even a Christian.

---

[1] The vicar-general at the confirmation of Dr. Gore as Bishop of Worcester, January 22, 1902.

[2] *The Chronicle of Convocation*, 1920, No. 2, p. 241.

Whatever theoretical objections may be urged to this method of appointment, it has undoubtedly some advantages. It avoids the division of opinion which in an election may lead either to the choice of a strong party man, or more likely to the 'safe' man who is not obviously objectionable to either wing. It has given to the episcopal bench men of ability and character who would have had little chance of election: it is difficult to think that a college of diocesan electors would have chosen Dr. Temple for Exeter, Dr. King for Lincoln, or even Dr. Gore for Worcester. The bishops of the Church of England are men of different experiences and views; the scholar, the educationalist, the administrator, and the parish priest are to be found among them; the central Churchman, the Evangelical, the High Churchman, and the Modernist are in their ranks, though it is a source of weakness that among them there is only one bishop who is definitely associated with the Anglo-Catholic party. The variety of thought and outlook on the episcopal bench has led occasionally to the public expression of differences of opinion which has been a source of some perplexity to the clergy and the laity; but this is better than the uniformity which comes from the rigid repression of individuality which is characteristic of the Roman Church, or the interminable quarrels over petty questions of precedence and dignity which were so marked a feature of episcopal relationships in the Middle Ages.

But it cannot be denied that appointment of bishops by the Prime Minister of the day is open to grave objections. Historically, nomination by the Crown has many precedents. In France, Spain and Germany for many centuries it was 'openly and formally accepted and regularised.'[1] But the Sovereign was the 'Christian Prince,' a member of the Church to which the bishop belonged. Even then the influence of the Crown on the appointment of bishops was often grossly abused. There is now always the danger that a Prime Minister, indifferent or even hostile to the Church of England, might take insufficient care over the appointment of its bishops, or, as in the case of the eighteenth century, make his selection on political grounds. More fundamental is the objection that whatever practical advantages may be urged for the existing system, it is clearly wrong that a spiritual society which claims to be the Body of Christ should have no effective voice in the choice of its chief pastors. With a growing sense of the divine commission of the Church it becomes impossible to acquiesce in this, especially as the House of Commons on which the Prime Minister depends for support may contain only a minority of Churchmen. While the Church remains established it is inevitable that the Crown should nominate; but the Dean and Chapter should have the right to refuse election and the archbishops to refuse consecration without incurring penalties, while the Prime Minister before submitting any name to the Crown should consult an advisory committee.[1]

---

[1] Lord Phillimore in Appendix V of the *Interim Report of the Appointment of Bishops Committee.*

In addition to the diocesan bishops there are suffragan bishops. In the reign of Henry VIII an Act was passed making provision for the appointment of bishops suffragan in certain towns. This Act was not put into action until 1870, when two suffragan bishops were appointed. Since then a number have been consecrated to assist in the larger dioceses. When a suffragan is required the diocesan bishop submits two names to the Crown, of whom almost invariably the first is chosen. The suffragan takes his title from a town within the diocese in which he works; and he holds a commission from the bishop which requires renewal when a new diocesan is appointed. The policy of appointing suffragan bishops is often criticised on the grounds that it does not give the suffragan sufficient authority and independence, and that where one is necessary the diocese ought to be divided. The system works most satisfactorily when the suffragan is given some definite work for which he is responsible, and in which he has full scope for initiative. It is essential that there should be close relationship and frequent communication between the diocesan and his suffragan so that each may be fully aware of the acts and decisions of the other and thus arrive at a common mind on diocesan problems. In some cases the suffragan is also archdeacon ; this gives him usually a place in Convocation and avoids the possible overlapping and even misunderstanding which may arise when suffragan and archdeacon are working in the same district. The two most serious defects in the present position of the suffragan are that his commission depends entirely upon the bishop who has granted it, so that with a change of diocesan he may find himself without pastoral work : and that he has no seat either in the Upper or Lower House of Convocation. For a time the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury allowed the suffragan bishops of that province to be present and to take part in its debates, but they had no vote : and in 1929 even this concession was withdrawn.

---

[1] *Interim Report of the Appointment of Bishops Committee*, p. 12.

Episcopacy and Establishment. The appointment of the bishops by the Crown is by far the most important result of Establishment upon Episcopacy in England. With this exception the position of a bishop in England is not constitutionally very different from that of the bishop of a Church which is not established. He pays homage to the King after his consecration before he can claim the temporalities of his see. He has certain privileges from the connection between Church and State. Chief among these is the right of the Archbishop of Canterbury to crown the Sovereign. The two Archbishops, the Bishops of London, Durham, Winchester and twenty-one other diocesan bishops have seats in the House of Lords. Frequent attendance at its debates is impossible to most of the bishops, who are usually fully engaged in their dioceses, but the Archbishop of Canterbury is regularly present, and on occasions when some Bill which directly affects religion or morals is under consideration a good number of bishops manage to attend. One of the bishops takes the prayers at the opening of each sitting. Establishment also means the recognition by the State of the provincial and diocesan courts. The fact that the bishop of the diocese belongs to the national Church gives him a representative and official character, so he is frequently in this capacity asked to take part in public functions in borough or county. But with these exceptions the immediate results of the connection between Church and State on the episcopate are slight, though naturally it shares with the clergy and laity the privileges and disabilities which Establishment brings to a Church.

The Bishop and the Central Assemblies of the Church. A bishop is not merely consecrated to a diocese, he is a bishop of the Catholic Church and his responsibilities extend far beyond the diocese in which he has jurisdiction. On his appointment to a see he finds himself at once a member of a college of bishops who, under the guidance of the archbishop, confer together on all matters that concern the welfare of the Church. He is ex-officio a member of the Upper House of the Convocation of the province in which his see is situated. In the 139th canon Convocation is described as 'the sacred Synod of this Nation,' 'the true Church of England by representation.' It is the lineal descendent of the pre-Reformation Convocation which met for the taxation of the clergy. The right of the clergy to tax themselves was surrendered in 1664, and in 1717 Convocation was practically suspended for 134 years. It continued during this time to meet *pro forma*, but no discussion was permitted, and it had no influence on the life and work of the Church; probably most Churchmen, clergy as well as laity, were unaware of its very existence. In 1852, after considerable agitation and hesitation, it was allowed once again to debate and to transact business. Since then Convocation has played an important part in the affairs of the Church. It has the right to legislate by canon, though for this the Royal Assent and license must be obtained. It is the constitutional assembly in which the bishops and clergy can form and express their mind on all matters which concern the doctrine, worship, discipline, and administration of the Church. Its decisions have great moral weight with the clergy. Convocation consists of two houses; the Upper is composed of the diocesan bishops of the province; the Lower of deans, archdeacons and elected clergy. It is summoned by Royal Writ shortly after the opening of Parliament and it is dissolved with the dissolution of Parliament. Usually it meets three times a year for a period of three or four days.

The other central council of which all diocesan bishops are members is the National Assembly of the Church of England. While Convocation consists solely of the bishops and clergy, this provides for the representation of the laity. It is made up of three houses, the House of Bishops, consisting of the members of the Upper Houses of Convocation; the House of Clergy, consisting of the members of the Lower Houses of Convocation; and the elected House of Laity. The Archbishop of Canterbury presides over the whole Assembly, which meets for five or six days three times each year. In December 1919 Parliament gave the Assembly powers to facilitate legislation on Church matters, subject always to the approval of both Houses of Parliament. The Convocations had framed the scheme so as not to encroach either on the authority of the bishops or on the traditional rights of Convocation. In the constitution it is carefully stated that 'any measure touching doctrinal formulæ or the services or ceremonies of the Church of England or the administration of the Sacraments or sacred rites thereof shall be debated and voted upon by each of the three Houses sitting separately, and shall then be either accepted or rejected by the Assembly in the terms in which it is finally proposed by the House of Bishops' (Clause xiv. 1). And in the fifteenth clause the powers of Convocation and of the bishops are expressly reserved: 'Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to diminish or derogate from any of the powers belonging to the Convocations of the Provinces of Canterbury and York or of any House thereof; nor shall the Assembly exercise any power or perform any function distinctively belonging to the Bishops in right of their episcopal office.' In this way it has been found possible to form bishops, clergy and laity into a representative assembly which is both deliberative and legislative without infringing the rights of the bishops.

In addition to these assemblies, meetings of the diocesan bishops are regularly held at Lambeth Palace. They, however, are quite unofficial and private; the agenda is not published, nor are the proceedings reported. While of great value to the bishops as affording opportunities for mutual consultation and the exchange of information and of opinions these meetings have no place in the constitution of the Church.

There are two central organisations of which the bishops are ex-officio members and at whose meetings they are supposed to attend at least three or four times in the year: the Ecclesiastical Commissioners who administer very large Church revenues, and Queen Anne's Bounty which is chiefly concerned with Parsonage Houses and with the collection and distribution of the tithe. By their membership the bishops are able to keep these Boards in touch with the special problems of the individual parishes of their dioceses.

Attendances at these meetings, as well as at some of the many committees which are appointed by both Convocation and the Church Assembly, make a severe tax on the time of the bishops; the total number of days spent in London for these central purposes takes them away from their dioceses for several weeks each year. Over-centralisation of work is becoming a real danger. Every year tends to make more demands on the bishops' time for meetings in London. In the past the bishop was often absent from his diocese for long periods for political reasons, or for his own pleasure or convenience; to-day his absence is due to the rapid and somewhat alarming growth of the central organisations of the Church.

The Bishop and his Diocese. But however many may be the claims of London meetings upon the bishop, by far the greater part of his time is spent in his diocese. In it his real work lies. In the last century a complete change came over the relationship of a bishop to his diocese. A long series of political appointments had almost obliterated the ideal of the bishop as a Father-in-God. Mr. Wakeman in his 'History of the Church of England' hardly exaggerates when he says that at the beginning of the last century 'the bishops were still amiable scholars who lived in dignified ease apart from their clergy, attended the King's levee, voted steadily in Parliament for the party of the minister who had appointed them, entertained country gentry when Parliament was not sitting, wrote learned books on points of classical scholarship, and occasionally were seen driving in state through the muddy country roads on their way to the chief towns of their diocese to hold a confirmation. Of spiritual leadership they had none.'[1] The change in the position and work of a bishop only dates from the middle of the nineteenth century. Samuel Wilberforce was the first of the modern bishops. It is true that before him there were to be found hard-working and zealous diocesans, but they were the exceptions standing out amidst a series of complacent, lethargic and sometimes worldly prelates. Wilberforce, more than any other man, gave the example which led to the adoption of a totally different standard of episcopal life and work. His biographer says, 'his conception of a Bishop's work and of diocesan administration was very largely original, or, if not original in the strict sense of the word, at all events it was at that date so unusual as to wear all the aspect of originality . . . it ought here to be emphatically stated, that the *idea* of Episcopacy with which Bishop Wilberforce set out, and which through life he consistently illustrated, was essentially his own. According to him the Bishop was to be as much the mainspring of all spiritual and religious energy in his diocese as a parochial clergyman is bound to be in his parish. It was the Bishop's duty to supply not merely advice and counsel to his clergy, but also that *momentum* which the sense of real supervision, however kindly and sympathising, always communicates to the mind and energy of the person supervised. It was his to care for his diocese as a whole, to learn for himself where needs existed, to take the necessary steps for supplying those needs, and to take care also that it was known that he so acted, and that he was at all times not only accessible to all men, but also ready personally to investigate on the spot any case that was brought before him.'[2] Since Wilberforce's day clergy and laity alike expect their bishop to be first and foremost a

---

[1] *An Introduction to the History of the Church of England*, p. 457.

[2] *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*, i. 343. Bishop of Oxford, 1845–69; Bishop of Winchester, 1869–73.

Father-in-God with a strong pastoral sense of his obligations towards his diocese. ..

In describing a bishop's work in his diocese it will be convenient to divide it into three groups—pastoral, administrative, and disciplinary. This division is arbitrary, for true episcopal work is almost always pastoral, and in practice it is impossible to distinguish exactly the pastoral work from the administrative, or the administrative from the disciplinary.

(1) *Pastoral Work.* Little need be said on this, for very much the same pastoral work is done by bishops in all parts of the world. There is first the work of selecting and ordaining candidates for the ministry. The difficulty of securing a sufficient supply of clergy is at present felt in every English diocese. In most dioceses there is a committee which recommends candidates for the bishop's acceptance and makes grants towards their training if the recommendation is endorsed by him. In the larger dioceses many hours are occupied by episcopal interviews with possible candidates, often both at the outset of their training as well as later when the candidate has to be approved finally for ordination. Most bishops expect their ordinands to have a degree or its equivalent, and, unless they are excused for some special reason or qualification, to pass the General Ordination Examination which sets an intellectual standard for candidates for all dioceses. Confirmations are an important feature in the direct pastoral work of a bishop; instead of being rare as was the case a century ago, they are now held with great frequency, either annually in large central churches or in groups, so that each parish church has a confirmation of its own at regular intervals. By visiting formally and informally the different parishes, by preaching in them from time to time, by addressing the meetings of Chapters and Conferences, and above all by personal interviews with his clergy, a bishop carries out his pastoral duties. Even in the large dioceses in which it is quite impossible to know all the laity he aims at knowing the incumbents, the assistant clergy, the leading laity and the main characteristics and problems of each parish. Often this pastoral work would be impossible without the daily

help of suffragan bishops who not only take many of the confirmations but also come into a personal relationship with the clergy and the parishes in the districts allotted to them.

(2) *Administration.* For purposes of administration a diocese is divided into archdeaconries and deaneries. The archdeacon has been described as the eye of the bishop: he is appointed by him, but unlike the bishop suffragan his office is a freehold and he does not require a fresh commission on a change of bishops. It is his duty to visit the churches of the diocese to see that their fabric is in order, that the registers are in safe custody and rightly kept, that ornaments are not illegally introduced into the church without a faculty. Archdeacons induct the newly-appointed incumbents. They have the right to hold courts. They hold an annual visitation, with the exception of the year in which the bishop visits in person, and they or their officers admit the newly-appointed churchwardens. The extent of the work of archdeacons depends largely upon the wish of the bishop, who in many cases uses them for purposes of inquiring into matters concerning the parsonage houses, the boundaries of the parish and the creation of new districts.

In each archdeaconry there are a number of rural deaneries. The rural dean in most cases is appointed directly by the bishop, though in some cases he is elected by the Chapter of clergy. He is in a sense a liaison officer between the bishop and the deanery; he keeps the bishop in touch with changes which might otherwise have passed unnoticed, and from him the bishop can seek for counsel and information about the parishes of the deanery. In most dioceses on two or three occasions in the year the bishop presides over a meeting of archdeacons and rural deans and with them discusses problems which concern the whole diocese. Through the suffragan bishops, the archdeacons and the rural deans, the diocesan bishop is able to supplement his own knowledge of the clergy and the parishes.

Where there is also a Synod of clergy he is able to confer with all the priests of his diocese. Only very gradually is it becoming established as a natural feature of English diocesan life. In the Middle Ages the bishop used it as part of his visitation, but there is no evidence that it was more than a somewhat formal meeting only occasionally summoned. Cranmer, in the *Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum*, provides that the bishop should summon a Synod each year 'to discuss all matters pertaining to the profit and well-being of the people of God,' but this was never put into force, and the first Synod held in modern days in England was summoned by Bishop Phillpotts at Exeter in 1851. Since then they have been held from time to time in some dioceses, and in a few they are held regularly. Considerable help was given to the movement for diocesan Synods by the statement in the Lambeth Appeal to all Christian People that 'we greatly desire that the office of a bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner.' And in 1922 the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury passed the resolution, 'That it is desirable that in this Province diocesan Synods of clergy should be summoned by diocesan bishops for the purpose of mutual consultation on matters concerning faith, worship, morals, discipline, and the pastoral office.' The rejection of the proposed revision of the Prayer Book and the necessity which the bishops felt of consulting with the clergy on the policy to be adopted in matters of public worship led to the summoning of Synods in most dioceses. Where the Synod has been tried for a number of years there can be no doubt that it has been of real assistance both to the bishop and diocese; it has enabled the bishop to consult the whole body of his presbyters, and his decisions have gained greatly in weight when they have received the approval of his clergy. It also gives the clergy the opportunity of expressing freely their criticisms of episcopal policy. The Synod is only summoned for the purpose of consultation, and the bishop can disregard its advice. Though there are still many dioceses in which a Synod has never assembled, and others in which it has been called only for special purposes, the desire of the clergy to have the opportunity of conferring in Synod with the bishop steadily grows, and there is every hope that it will eventually become an essential part of the organisation of every diocese. It must, however, be admitted quite frankly that this is still far off from realisation.

On the other hand, the Diocesan Conference is now universally and legally established. It consists of the Bishop, the Chamber of Clergy, and the Chamber of Laity. It is competent to deliberate 'on all matters concerning the Church of England in the diocese and . . . to make such provision in respect to those matters as according to the ruling of the Bishop may be within the competency of the Conference ; Provided always that it does not belong to the functions of a Conference to issue any statement purporting to declare the doctrine of the Church on any question of theology, and no such statement shall be issued by any Conference.' The bishop presides over the conference, his assent is necessary before any resolution (except for questions relating to conduct of business) can be approved as an act of conference, and he decides the time and place of the annual meeting.

Much of a bishop's administrative work is in relation to the clergy. Generally speaking, no clergyman may preach, officiate or administer the sacraments in a diocese without the sanction of the bishop. This is given in one of three ways : by *institution*, when a clergyman is accepted by the bishop as the incumbent of a parish and is duly instituted by him ; by *license*, ministers in charge of districts which are not yet parishes, chaplains to institutions, public preachers and assistant curates are licensed ; by *permission*, which is either for a short period when the curate is waiting for license, or is given and renewed annually for those who are not engaged in full-time work. In all cases before institution and usually before a license is granted, the oath of canonical obedience to the bishop is taken.

In matters of patronage the bishop has important but strictly limited powers. In some dioceses episcopal patronage is on a large scale and there are many parishes within the gift of the bishop ; in his choice of incumbents for these he has most ample discretion, though as a rule he will naturally make his selection from those who have worked in his diocese. In the majority of cases the nomination to a vacancy lies with some public or private patron, or with some party trust. After the clerk approached has signified to the patron his acceptance, the bishop is informed. He makes inquiries about his antecedents, and if the replies are satisfactory agrees to institute after the notice of appointment has been posted for one month on the church door. He can only refuse to institute on certain definite grounds which he must state in writing. He may refuse the man who has been presented to him 'on the ground of insufficient learning, or of vicious conduct, heresy or offences against ecclesiastical law in matters of ritual, anything in short which if it occurred after admission might be a ground for depriving him of his benefice.'[1] Various offences which would come under the law of simony would also justify refusal to institute. But the bishop may not deny institution on general grounds, such as that he is convinced the man is totally unsuitable for the parish, that his appointment is objected to by the congregation to which he is to minister, or that he proposes to reverse the teaching and services to which his new parish has been accustomed. In these cases the bishop may remonstrate privately, or protest publicly, but in law he is powerless and cannot refuse institution. If he refuses the patron has the right to appeal against his decision. If the refusal is on grounds of ritual or doctrine, the appeal is either by the presentee to the ecclesiastical court of the province or by the patron to the High Court of Justice. When other grounds of disqualification are alleged the appeal is to a court consisting of the archbishop of the province and a judge of the Supreme Court, appointed by the Lord Chancellor.

The bishop must either personally or through his officers see that the beneficed clergy perform their duties in the parishes to which they have been instituted. By Canon 60 it is assumed that he will conduct a visitation once in three years at the same time that he or his suffragan confirms the children of the parish. This rule is by no means invariably followed, and the formal visitation frequently takes place at a longer interval of time. Usually it has two features: a series of questions are sent to the incumbents making inquiries about the performance of their pastoral duties, their conduct of divine worship, and about other matters concerning their parishes ; and at the close of the visitation the clergy of the diocese are summoned to a centre where the bishop delivers a charge, or series of charges, on any matters which he regards as important. Occasionally the visitation is much more thorough, and the bishop goes from parish to parish discussing with the incumbents the replies to his questions, interviewing the churchwardens, and inspecting the church and its furniture. Quite apart from such a formal visitation, the bishop is usually moving about the diocese, confirming, instituting, preaching, consecrating, and in this way he keeps in touch with the different parishes. This personal knowledge of the clergy and their parishes is invaluable to the bishop in his administrative and pastoral work. He knows who deserve promotion and encouragement, who require exhortation or rebuke. He knows the parishes where Church extension is most needed, and where the churches call for repair and restoration. He knows where he can most safely send a deacon for his first curacy as well as where the incumbent is tired or stale and needs a change of work. From first-hand knowledge he is able to advise the Diocesan Funds as to the parishes to which grants can be made most usefully. The best administrator is almost invariably the man who knows personally those who are under his supervision.

---

[1] P. V. Smith, *The Legal Position of the Clergy*, p. 29.

Of all questions with which the bishops have had to deal during the last three-quarters of a century, those connected with the ritual and ceremonial of the Church have been the most difficult and persistent. Changes in the customary method of conducting public worship have caused long and bitter controversy. There are few English bishops to-day who have not spent many anxious days and hours over the rulings they have had to give on these matters. No part of their administrative work has been more frequently criticised than the policy they have adopted either as individuals or as a body towards the changes which have been introduced into the services of the Church. The law itself is clear and rigid. By the Acts of Uniformity the clergy are forbidden ‘ to use any other rite, ceremony, order, form, or manner of celebrating the Lord’s Supper, openly or privately, or other open prayers than is mentioned and set forth' in the Prayer Book of 1662. Every clergyman before he is licensed or instituted renews the promise he made at his ordination that in public prayer and administration of the sacraments he will use the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer and none other except so far as ordered by lawful authority. In 1872 the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act made some modifications in the law; by the most important of these it allowed on weekdays a shortened form of morning and evening prayer, and on special occasions forms of services taken from the Scriptures and the Prayer Book and approved by the Ordinary. In recent years statutory authority has been given to a revised Lectionary. But to all intents and purposes the law of public worship, which the bishops are supposed to administer, was drawn up over 260 years ago. At no time does it appear that this law has been strictly observed, 'as a matter of history, deviations from the standard set up by the Acts of Uniformity can be shown not only to have existed but also to have been tolerated in every period since the Act of Uniformity of 1559.'[1] With the revival of Church worship and life in the middle of the last century it was soon felt that the Prayer Book services required both variation and enrichment. At first the changes introduced were defended, often quite truly, on the claim that they were in strict accordance with the letter and the intention of the Prayer Book; but within a few years alterations were made in public worship and additional services brought into use which could not be justified as covered by the Prayer Book. The changes in worship thus effected were the expression of a new life and energy surging up in the Church and were intended both to make the services more worthy of the worship of God and to bring them into closer relationship with the needs and problems of men and women who lived not in the seventeenth but in the twentieth century. In many cases the changes introduced were of small importance, in others they transformed the traditional services of the Church of England. While some had no doctrinal significance, others were deliberately adopted on account of their doctrinal importance. Often the innovations were bitterly resented and fiercely opposed. But to a greater or less degree the movement for change in worship had its effect on every parish, and there is hardly a church in England to-day which does not depart to some extent from the directions of the Prayer Book.

---

[1] *Report of Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, p. 9.

From all sides the bishops were urged to deal with these irregularities. Their policy was twofold, to repress what they regarded as clearly contrary to the teaching of the Church of England, and by the exercise of their *jus liturgicum* to permit what they felt to be both consistent with its doctrinal position and edifying to the worshipper. The policy of repression through the law-courts failed, public opinion would not tolerate for long the imprisonment of clergy who were unable, for conscientious reasons, to accept the jurisdiction of the courts before which they were brought. The restraining influence of the bishops when they asked for obedience to their spiritual authority was much more effective than is usually recognised ; many practices were abandoned in response to the demand for canonical obedience. But in addition to repression they exercised a *jus liturgicum* which many of them held to be inherent in their episcopal office, and by it gave authority to variations from and additions to the Book of Common Prayer. A limited form of this was claimed by Archbishop Temple who held that the bishop might authorise special services and parts of services which, though not in terms taken from the Prayer Book, are in harmony with it.[1] As an administrative expedient the exercise of a *jus liturgicum* was essential. Without it no episcopal sanction could have been given to many additions and variations which were clearly of devotional value ; and in the place of any attempt at regulation the bishop would have been compelled to oppose almost every suggestion of liturgical change on the ground that it was not allowed by the Acts of Uniformity. As a matter of fact these Acts had a disastrous and hampering effect on the bishops at a time when some amendment of public worship was necessary ; they took from them freedom of action, and the initiative for liturgical change passed from the episcopal bench to the parochial clergy. Even the limited *jus liturgicum* exercised by most of the bishops was open to serious objections. It led to widely different rulings in different dioceses, so that what was sanctioned by one bishop was often forbidden by another. It was also criticised on the ground of illegality: the Royal Commission states in its report 'there cannot, in our opinion, be any doubt that the Acts of Uniformity bind bishops as well as other clergymen; and that the law does not recognise any right in a bishop to override the provisions as to services, rites and ceremonies contained in these Acts.'[1]

---

[1] *Frederick Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury,* ii. 161.

These objections would have been met if the proposed revision of the Prayer Book had received statutory authority. It would have given the desired enrichment to the worship of the Church, it would have set a definite limit to what was regarded as permissible; it would have removed the reproach that bishops and clergy alike were acting illegally when they approved or used what was not found within the Prayer Book. Notwithstanding strong opposition to the Book, both from within and without the Church, it was twice sent forward to Parliament by very large majorities in Convocation and the Church Assembly, but on each occasion, in 1927 and 1928, it was rejected by the House of Commons. This was largely due to the fact that the revised Book contained a new Order of Communion and provisions for perpetual reservation.

By the action of the House of Commons the bishops were placed in a most difficult position. They might have asked Convocation there and then to sanction the new proposals: this would have been interpreted rightly as a direct challenge to the State, and many who had been strong supporters of the Book would have opposed this policy. They might have gone again to Parliament with a new Book containing only the non-controversial matter: this would have involved an acceptance of the principle that Parliament has a right to regulate the worship of the Church, and it would have left untouched the very matters over which there had been most difficulty and controversy.

---

[1] *Report of Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, p. 10.

To do nothing, to allow matters to drift for another few years would have been a course as cowardly in spirit as disastrous in its practical results. The bishops eventually decided by a large majority that they could not regard as inconsistent with loyalty to the principles of the Church of England the use of the additions or deviations which were contained in the Book of 1928; that during the present emergency they would therefore be guided by the proposals set forth in that Book both in what they would permit and what they would forbid, provided always that the use of the Forms and Orders contained in the Book of 1928 had the goodwill of the people of the parish as represented in the Parochial Church Council. This policy was approved by the great majority of the Synods and Conferences of the dioceses and finally was submitted to and accepted by the Houses of Convocation. One paragraph of the resolution passed by the Convocations should be quoted in full as it states concisely the practical bearings of this policy, 'That accordingly the Bishops, in the exercise of that legal or administrative discretion which belongs to each Bishop in his own diocese, will be guided by the proposals set forth in the Book of 1928, and will endeavour to secure that the practices which are consistent neither with the Book of 1662 nor with the Book of 1928 shall cease.'

This line of action has obvious disadvantages: the bishops have no statutory power behind them: they are open to the criticism that they are acting in defiance of Parliament, that they themselves are giving an example of lawlessness: there is always the danger that permissions which they have granted might be challenged in the law courts and might result in a judicial decision which would reveal a serious divergence between the law of the State and the practice of the Church. In any other country but England the present position would be hopeless: it could only end either in the complete separation between Church and State or in the Church accepting a position of subjection to the State on matters which concern its spiritual life. But lack of logic combined with plenty of good common sense has always been a characteristic of Englishmen and has averted many a grave crisis. So far restraint has been manifested on all sides. Variations and additions permitted by the rejected Book are rapidly coming into use with the goodwill of the people, while practices clearly inconsistent with both the 1662 and 1928 Books are gradually ceasing. The bishops have the great advantage that in future for their administrative decisions in matters of worship they can appeal to a Book which has spiritual authority behind it: with the acceptance of a common standard the perplexing divergencies in rulings will gradually disappear, though this will not be the case with the few dioceses whose bishops find themselves unable conscientiously to act on the policy adopted by their brethren.

(3) *Discipline.* At his consecration a bishop promises to correct and punish unquiet, disobedient and criminous men within his diocese according to such authority he has by God's Word and as shall be committed to him by the ordinance of the Realm. In practice the exercise of discipline is confined to the clergy of his diocese who have taken the oath of canonical obedience, though on rare occasions he may have to order or to approve the excommunication of a layman. The bishop has three methods which he uses in exercising discipline. He can use godly admonition: of all ways which make for discipline this is both the mildest and at the same time the most effective; it is the spiritual and moral appeal of a Father-in-God to a son whom he wishes to win to obedience. Every priest at his ordination has pledged himself to obey those set over him 'following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions.' Next in the case of an unbeneficed clergyman he can withdraw his license or permission to officiate, and if necessary he can follow this up by a formal inhibition. When these two methods fail or are inapplicable he can resort to the ecclesiastical courts.

Every bishop has his own court, called the Consistory. As a rule he does not sit in it himself, but he delegates part of his jurisdiction to a judge who is called the Chancellor and who presides over the Consistory Court. The Consistory Court deals with applications for faculties, but it also tries clergy who are charged before it with moral or ecclesiastical offences. Above the diocesan courts there is the

Archbishop's Provincial Court, called in the province of Canterbury the Court of Arches, and in that of York the Chancery Court; the chief business of this court is concerned with appeals from the lower courts and its decisions are given by a judge appointed by the archbishop. The Consistory and the Provincial Courts have the power of suspending, depriving, or deposing the accused if he is found guilty. These courts and their decisions are recognised by the State. From them, however, there is an appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, whose decision is final. In addition there is the court consisting of the archbishop and a judge of the Supreme Court appointed by the Lord Chancellor, which deals with cases which arise from a bishop refusing to institute a presentee to a benefice, and with appeals made by incumbents who have been found negligent in the performance of their duties.

There are three groups of offences which may be brought by the bishop before one or other of these courts. There are the cases of negligence; successful legal action in these is difficult unless the conduct of the incumbent causes a scandal by inadequate or improper performance of his duties, though procedure has been recently simplified by the Benefices Measure of 1926 which enables a bishop, if the commission he has appointed reports negligence to him, to nominate a curate who will be paid out of the income of the benefice and to inhibit the offending incumbent from officiating. There are, secondly, cases of immorality; by the Clergy Discipline Act of 1892 the bishop, without further trial, can deprive incumbents who have been convicted of certain offences in the temporal courts; in other cases the trial takes place in the Consistory Court before the Chancellor, with the addition of four assessors to consider any question of fact; the sentence, if any, is decided on and pronounced by the bishop.

The third group of cases consists of offences in respect of the ritual and ornaments of the Church. These can be brought before the diocesan or provincial courts. But for many years there have been few prosecutions. A large number of clergy and laity refuse to accept or to respect the decisions of the present ecclesiastical courts on the ground that they are not spiritual. This is not true of the constitution of the diocesan or provincial courts in which the judge is appointed by the bishop. But the final court of appeal, the Judicial Committee, receives its authority solely from the State, and it is claimed that its decisions are bound to be followed by the lower courts. 'A court dealing with matters of conscience and religion must, above all others, rest on moral authority if its judgments are to be effective. As thousands of clergy with strong lay support refuse to recognise the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee, its judgments cannot practically be enforced.'[1] The bishops have, therefore, usually felt it impossible to prosecute their clergy before courts in which they were conscientiously bound to refuse to plead. But it is not only bishops who have the right to take action against the clergy: the law may be set in motion by the laity under the Clergy Discipline Act and the Public Worship Act; when this has been done the bishops have frequently used their right to veto prosecutions which they have considered vexatious, oppressive, or likely to be harmful to the Church.

The judicial system of Church courts as far as they relate to ritual offences is practically inoperative at the present time. On almost every side it is thought that under existing conditions they should not be used for the restoration of Church order. From time to time recommendations have been made for the reform of the final court of appeal, so as to remove the difficulties which are felt about its spiritual jurisdiction. The latest of these came from a committee of the Church Assembly which reported in 1926. But these reforms would require an Act of Parliament, and it is unlikely that for many years to come it will be possible to obtain this legislation. The breakdown of ecclesiastical discipline by means of the courts does not, however, leave the bishop powerless in the face of deliberate disobedience to the laws of the Church; it is true it is impossible for him to remove the offender from his benefice, but he can make it plain that he regards him as a man who has broken his oath of canonical obedience, that he cannot therefore either entrust a curate to his care or give future preferment to one who has committed such a grave moral offence. When the bishop passes censure on a clergyman after consultation with his Synod his condemnation is greatly strengthened. In the past obedience has often been refused from fear that the bishop was acting on his prejudices rather than as the representative of the Church. This would be removed if the bishop acted with the full approval of his Synod. Few men would resist a bishop when he called upon them to render canonical obedience to a decision which had been reached by Convocation and endorsed by the diocesan Synod. Refusal to obey would be condemned by clergy and laity alike. Gradually the steady pressure of the collective conscience of the Church would reduce cases of disobedience to a negligible quantity.

---

[1] *Report of Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, p. 67.

The Archiepiscopal Court. Perhaps some mention ought to be made of the archbishop's jurisdiction over the diocesan bishops of his province. In 1888 the Church Association requested the Archbishop of Canterbury to cite and try the Bishop of Lincoln for certain alleged ritual acts and offences. The Archiepiscopal Court was of doubtful authority: there had been only one instance of its jurisdiction since the Reformation. The Privy Council declared, however, that 'the Archbishop had jurisdiction in this case.' When Archbishop Benson with five diocesan bishops as assessors opened the court in 1889 the Bishop of Lincoln protested against it, but this was overruled by the Archbishop, who stated that 'The court finds that from the most ancient times of the Church the Archiepiscopal jurisdiction in the case of suffragans has existed.'[1] Though the bishop then appeared before the court his counsel renewed the protest at every stage of the proceedings. Its findings were in the main upheld by the Privy Council, to which the promoters made appeal.

Summary. During the last three-quarters of a century episcopacy in England has been in a state of change and development which is not yet completed. In essence of course it remains the same, but the modifications which it has undergone in external form and in its actual functioning have been remarkable. In three directions the changes have been most significant. The ideal of the bishop as Father-in-God who knows and cares for his flock, who moves freely among his clergy and his parishes, has taken the place of the once common conception of the bishop as a prelate who lived in remote dignity in his palace or castle. The frequent complaint against the bishop to-day is not that he has a passive and leisurely life, but that his activities are such that he has insufficient time for prayer and study. Secondly, the bishops are in the process of losing much of their monarchical authority and independence, for on the one hand they act much more frequently with one another as members of a college, while on the other in their dioceses in Synod and Diocesan Conference they confer with their clergy and laity; a more constitutional idea of episcopacy is gradually being realised. But, thirdly, while the bishops have lost some of the authority they used to derive from the temporal dignity of their position, they are now relying much more on the spiritual resources of their order; this has been seen most markedly both in the tacit abandonment of prosecution as a method of securing obedience and in their resolve to take the rejected Prayer Book as the standard of the directions given in matters of public worship. The future alone will show how far this stronger assertion of the spiritual aspects of episcopacy is compatible with an Established Church.

---

[1] *The Life of Edward White Benson*, p. 399 (abridged edition).

IV

(ii) THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION: WALES

By L. J. Hopkin James

If it be true that 'an Englishman loves a lord,' the fact that a Welshman loves a bishop will hardly be doubted. The office of a bishop has always been respected even in Nonconformist Wales, and even when our bishops were more often than not non-resident. The traditions of our greatest Saints are and always have been centred round our ancient sees and have manifested themselves in the writings of our Cymric forefathers, the tales of our minstrels and the songs of our bards, which are shared by all the people of Wales irrespective of their denominational principles and religious beliefs. It mattered not whether bishops were of our own kith and kin, or whether they came from across the border; witness the progress through Wales of two mediaeval Archbishops of Canterbury and the warm greeting they received from the Welsh people wherever they went. We are a democratic people, but we love a bishop, and Nonconformists as well as Churchmen hold the office in the highest respect.

When at the dissolution of our ancient ecclesiastical corporations by the Disestablishment Act the work of reconstruction was taken in hand, the greatest possible care was exercised by the framers of our democratic constitution that every right which was inherent in the episcopal office should be preserved inviolate.

Indeed, in our disestablished state the power of the episcopate in the province of Wales is even greater than it was when our bishops were appointed by the Crown, for now they have a veto on all ecclesiastical legislation, more patronage in their gift than they ever had before, and a far more effective voice and influence in all other patronage, which they share and in a very large measure control. The old Cyprianic idea of a bishop being a bishop, not only of his diocese, but of the Church as a whole, is now more clearly shown amongst us as a result of our provincial organisation.

Though we speak of the ancient British Church, or of the old Church in Wales, it is clear that before the Welsh dioceses were incorporated into the province of Canterbury there was no such thing as a Welsh Church considered as a separate and corporate entity; there was no autocephalous Church in Wales, but only four dioceses corresponding most probably to four petty kingdoms, each independent of the other and very jealous of its own independence and possessions.

The formation of Wales into a province with an archbishop over all has given us such unity as the Church in Wales has never known before, and a realisation of corporate Church life such as was beyond our dreams to anticipate. Moreover, we have been greatly helped in this by the personality and energy of our Archbishop, who is now a familiar figure in every diocese of Wales.

The Ignatian principle of ‘ nothing without the bishop ’ is shown especially in our legislative machinery, which provides that nothing can become of binding force in the province of Wales without the assent of the bishops. This pre-eminence of the episcopate is augmented by the fact of its solidarity. It is elected by the whole of the Church in Wales and not merely by a particular diocese.

Churchmen in Llandaff, for instance, recognise that the Bishop of St. David’s belongs to them, that they had a voice in his appointment, that he is one with them in all legislation that bears upon the work of the Church in the province, even though he has no immediate jurisdiction over them.

The Welsh Churchman knows that, if he has the status of a communicant and is entered on the electoral roll of his church, he has the right to vote for the members of his Parochial Church Council; that they elect the members of the Ruridecanal Conference; that that body in its turn chooses the representatives for the Diocesan Conference. He knows that the Diocesan Conference elects the lay and clerical members to represent the diocese in the Electoral College, which includes the representatives from each diocese. When the Electoral College meets to choose a bishop for a vacant see, the bishop-elect must receive two-thirds of the votes. If that majority is not forthcoming, then the choice rests with the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Welsh Churchmen through the instruction of their parish priests are becoming familiar with the working of their constitution, and know by this time that their bishops are elected by themselves, and that they represent not their own dioceses only but the whole province of Wales. Theoretically, of course, every bishop represents the Catholic Church as a whole, and in Wales the *provincial* character of the electorate helps to keep this fact in mind. The clerical members of the Electoral College are, as a rule, the most popular clergy of the Church in Wales and by no means all of Cymric extraction, while the lay element consists of the most prominent laymen in the Principality, most of them being drawn from the ranks of the landed gentry, great business men, or those who have risen to eminence in the learned professions. No fault is found with the type of the episcopal elector, whether clerical or lay, and no criticisms have been uttered as to any inadequacy of their endowments for the task. No one has ever said that they are lacking either in ability or grace.

After some years' working, during which there have been two appointments to the see of Monmouth, one to Swansea and Brecon, one to St. David's, and two to Bangor, no whisper has yet been heard that any better system could have been devised. Any attempt at canvassing is regarded as unworthy and futile. The spirit of provincial loyalty has in every case hitherto in the end secured two-thirds of the votes, for it is considered unworthy of us if the requisite majority be not secured and the choice has to go to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The only danger lies in the direction that perhaps we may become too provincial in our outlook, and in the course of time partakers of provincial mediocrity: for Wales is after all but a small country, and we feel already the lack of fellowship and interchange of gifts with our brethren in the Church of England. It would be a good thing if there could be freer interchange between Wales and England in the matter of appointment to benefices.

After election there is the further process of confirmation by the bishops of the province, for no man can become a bishop of the Church in Wales without the assent of the episcopate of Wales.

Whatever the Governing Body may determine, no law of the Church may be altered, no canon promulged, no decree be valid without the assent of the episcopate of the province. Thus the position of the ancient Synod of the province is fully secured; the name of Synod has been deliberately withheld from the Governing Body. Hitherto this procedure has been free from friction of any kind under the wise direction of our Archbishop, and there are no signs whatever that it will not continue so to be.

The geographical area of Wales is so small, and the proceedings of the Governing Body are so well reported in the Press, that the centre of interest has been shifted from the Diocesan Conference as an institution to the Governing Body.

The majority of the principal laymen now attend the meetings of the Governing Body in very large numbers, and the Diocesan Conferences have, to a large extent, lost their influence.

We are accustomed now to think on provincial rather than on diocesan lines, and our Diocesan Conferences are now somewhat dull (as they deal with the routine of diocesan administration), as compared with what they were in the days when they were regarded as something in the nature of debating societies.

Now that the Church in Wales is free from the Public Worship Regulation Act, the recommendations of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and the decisions of the English courts, the *jus liturgicum* of our bishops has considerably increased, and we in Wales are not bothered with any ‘crisis’ in the Church.

When the time comes for Prayer Book revision in our province, we shall be guided by our bishops, and will follow their lead.

No Diocesan Synods have as yet been held in the province. Efforts have been made in speeches in the Governing Body to establish them, but nothing has come of this. The general opinion seems to be that it is a matter for each individual bishop to decide for himself, and some of our bishops have been heard to say that when there appears to be a need for them they will be held and not before.

The Bishop's Triennial Visitation seems to have been abandoned, and we are no longer 'charged' by our episcopal fathers as we were aforetime. Instead whereof some of our bishops visit their clergy and laity in an informal manner at the ruridecanal centres, where they speak face to face with the people in conference. Hitherto this method has been a success, as it has brought the bishop into closer contact with his people in this 'heart to heart' manner.

The Welsh bishops, even in the days of the Establishment, were perhaps in closer contact with their cathedrals than their brethren in England were.

The appointment of the dean and of all the canons of his cathedral church, as well as that of his principal administrative officer, the archdeacon, lies in the hands of each Welsh bishop.

The bishop is the *principal* head of the Chapter as contrasted with its '*numeral* head,' the dean. In theory each Chapter is the Council of the bishop, and provision is made for it to function as such, but in practice the bishops seem to rely more on the diocesan [1] than on the cathedral Chapter.

There is something to be said for this, as in practice the work of a rural dean is of more utility to the Church than that of a canon of a cathedral where no residence is *of obligation*, as in the case of Llandaff, and no rule is kept except that of attendance at Chapter meetings and the preaching of four sermons during the course of the year. This does not apply to all the Welsh cathedrals, for in all but one of them the month's residence is a real thing. The same financial conditions are in being in all.

---

[1] 'We have further recommended, in the case of all cathedrals, that there shall be a diocesan Chapter, which may be summoned by the bishop of the diocese when he thinks fit. We have recommended, that to this Chapter it shall be lawful for the bishop to summon, in addition to the members of the ordinary greater Chapter, the rural deans of the diocese and proctors of the clergy in Convocation.' *Cathedral Commissioners' Report*, 1882.

At present the allowance of £250 a year for each cathedral, to be divided amongst all the residentiary canons, shows in what practical value the office is held by the Governing Body!

Dr. Green, when Bishop of Monmouth, refused to appoint canons, on the ground that he did not wish to create empty titles.

Each bishop is now empowered to appoint three honorary canons for his diocese, and these gentlemen are verily what were of old described as 'canons at grass (*in herbis*)' for they have no stalls assigned to them, nor are they members of the cathedral Chapter.

The cathedral system does not seem to find much favour in the Governing Body, and attempts have been made, happily without success, to displace the dean's authority in favour of the bishop. Fortunately the Welsh bishops appear to agree with Archbishop Benson: 'And we have had episcopal propositions to loosen episcopal knots by promoting bishops to be deans. Let us trust we have heard the last of these things. A diocese and its clergy need great, bright, central houses of work, worship, counsel, and sympathy; and a house must have a head. A bishop, too, needs them. Let everything be done to bring them to their ideal and to invest them with all that can advance their "gladness and sedulity."'[1]

Our new constitution has brought with it an alteration in the appointment of rural deans. Prior to Disestablishment the choice lay unfettered in the hands of the bishop. Now the bishop has to choose from a list of three elected by the clergy of the deanery in the order of their choice. Some of our bishops more often than not attach no importance to the order in which the names appear, but select the priest whom they consider best fitted for the office.

---

[1] *The Cathedral*, p. 43.

In appointments to parochial benefices the bishop's patronage has increased since Disestablishment. Now he has in full right of his bishopric the gift of one in three of all the livings in his diocese. As ex-officio chairman of the Patronage Board of the diocese he has a powerful voice in the remaining two-thirds.

It is true that the Board consists of the archdeacon ex-officio, two clerical and three lay members elected by the Diocesan Conference, and two parochial lay representatives elected by the Parochial Church Council of the vacant parish, but it is natural that the bishop as chairman should carry great weight, as he is supposed to have personal knowledge of all his clergy. The respect in which the episcopate is held makes it very difficult for any Diocesan Patronage Board to act contrary to the bishop's wishes.

The Provincial Patronage Board was created to meet a need, and its creation has been amply justified. It consists of the Archbishop, the bishop of the diocese wherein the vacant cure lies, the chairman of the Representative Body, or a layman nominated by him to act in his stead. It appoints at present to all benefices where the turn of the Diocesan Patronage Board has been exercised since Disestablishment.

The whole of our patronage system works fairly well, but considerable doubts are felt among the clergy as to whether we have improved upon the old system which was swept away by the Disestablishment Act. If a clergyman incurs episcopal displeasure, what chance has he of preferment to-day? With private patronage his chances would be many. The system is not conducive to independence of mind and character.

Again, the parochial representatives, if they do not get their own way and their man appointed, are apt to say 'What is the good of bringing us here when it has all been cut and dried beforehand? Would it not be better if the bishop himself were to make all the appointments?'

The administration of episcopal patronage has been regarded as so scrupulously fair that of our three systems it is perhaps held in the highest repute. Many episcopal appointments, regarded with surprise at the time, have proved to be successful. The Patronage Board system lends itself to a considerable amount of canvassing, especially of the parochial representatives. In many cases Parochial Church Councils have been known to furnish their representatives with their 'mandate' for the appointment of some particular man, but the bishops are as a rule careful to remind them that they appear at the Patronage Board as representatives and not as delegates. The only private patronage which remains is for the first turn only, where some private benefactor endows a new benefice. This, however, occurs so rarely that it can hardly be taken into account as being part of our normal system.

The multiplication of Confirmation centres has brought our bishops into closer touch with the people. It was noted by Giraldus Cambrensis many centuries ago how the Welsh people loved Confirmation: 'Beyond any other race the whole people seeks Confirmation by the bishop, and the anointing of that unction wherein the grace of the Spirit is given.' This is largely true to-day, and a very large number of Nonconformists in Wales have been confirmed.

Our diocesan bishops are given power (if they be so minded) of appointing assistant bishops to help them in this and other work, but the Governing Body views with a very watchful eye the appointment of bishops-suffragan, though we had them in Wales in the time of Henry VIII. Objection has been taken to their appointment on the ground that the office for the consecration of a bishop implies that a bishop has jurisdiction, whereas a bishop-suffragan has not; but it was pointed out in reply that the office of ordination to the priesthood implies that every priest has jurisdiction, whereas an assistant curate has only delegated jurisdiction. Of late, however, a bishop-suffragan has been appointed for the diocese of St. Asaph to assist the Archbishop in his Confirmations.

Our bishops are now paid a stipend of £1600 per annum, with a further allowance of £800 for their expenses.

Episcopal houses of residence are provided for them, and as there is a sentimental value attached to the palaces of Llandaff, Abergwili, and St. Asaph, those who occupy them are to receive £400 a year in addition to their stipends, on account of the extra cost of their upkeep. A pension of half his stipend is given to a diocesan bishop on retirement.

The movement for the extension of the episcopate in Wales by the creation of new sees received its driving power from some energetic laymen led by the late Mr. Wilfred de Winton.

To all appearances it drew forth very little enthusiasm from those whom it chiefly concerned, the Bishop of Llandaff and the late Bishop of St. David's.

Amongst his friends the late Bishop Owen of St. David's asked the question : ' Wherein does a bishop's chief work consist ? ' His own answer was that a bishop was first and foremost an administrator. He said that he was kept in full touch with all that went on in his extensive diocese through his four archdeacons. Furthermore, he said he did not believe it was good for the clergy to see too much of their bishop. Many thought at the time that the money spent on the creation of new sees could have been better applied in raising the stipends of the sadly underpaid clergy.

The danger already exists of making our dioceses into watertight compartments. Llandaff is essentially an industrial diocese ; Monmouth in comparison with it is an agricultural diocese. Where are the country livings in Llandaff for those who have worked hard in the heart of the South Wales coalfield ? They used to be found in Monmouthshire ; but now that Monmouth is a separate diocese, it is natural that its country livings should be reserved for its own clergy. Provincial patronage has done something to mitigate the difficulties of the situation, but much more could be done by a greater interchange of clergy throughout the province. This has been found in practice to be one of the greatest objections to the creation of new sees.

The Archbishop has more than once given the impression that he is against the creation of more dioceses as it tends to cheapen the office of a bishop, and already canons seem to be as plentiful in Wales as were colonels in America after the civil wars.

With it all we can thank God and take courage, in the assurance that in a democratic age we have retained everything that is essential, and have lost nothing which is inherent in the office of a bishop in the Church of God.

Some extracts from the Constitution may prove interesting, especially to English readers who will like to see how a disestablished Church works so near home.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL POSITION OF THE BISHOPS OF THE CHURCH IN WALES

I. In Relation to the Governing Body

CHAPTER II

The Governing Body

1.

The Governing Body of the Church in Wales shall consist of three distinct Orders, namely : the Bishops, the Clergy, and the Laity.

29.

Subject to this Constitution no proceeding of the Governing Body shall interfere with the exercise by the Archbishop of the powers and functions inherent in the office of Metropolitan, nor with the exercise by the Diocesan Bishops of the powers and functions inherent in the Episcopal Office.

34.

The Governing Body shall have power to make alterations in articles, doctrinal statements, rites, ceremonies, and formularies, provided that no alteration shall be made except by a Bill as hereinafter set forth, backed and introduced in the Governing Body by a majority of the Order of the Bishops, unless such alteration shall have been accepted and assented to by the Church of England, in which event a Bill as hereinafter set forth may be backed and introduced in the Governing Body by any ten members thereof.

38.

. . . .

If the Bill is passed by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting of each of the three Orders, the President shall promulgate it as a canon of the Church in Wales, and it shall thenceforth be a law of the Church in Wales and binding on all the members thereof.

Provided always that the Order of the Bishops shall not vote till after the declaration of the votes of the other two Orders. Upon such declaration of votes the Order of the Bishops may, if they think fit, retire for private debate, and announce the result of their voting at such later time during that session of the Governing Body as they shall think fit.

CHAPTER VII

II. Appointments and Patronage in the Church in Wales

5.

The right to collate or nominate to vacant cures shall in the case of each parish be vested in the Bishop twice in seven vacancies, in the Diocesan Patronage Board four times, and in the Provincial Patronage Board on the remaining occasion.

33.

The Provincial Patronage Board shall consist of:

(1) The Archbishop;

(2) The Bishop of the Diocese in which the vacancy has occurred;

(3) One layman—namely, the chairman of the Representative Body (if a layman), or a layman nominated by him, or in the event of the chairman of the Representative Body not being a layman, then a layman nominated by him.

CHAPTER VIII

III. Election of Bishops

2.

The election of a Diocesan Bishop of the Church in Wales shall be by an Electoral College, constituted as hereinafter provided.

3.

Each Diocesan Conference shall, at its first meeting, and at each subsequent first meeting of any newly-elected Diocesan Conference, appoint six clergymen in Priest's Orders, and six laymen to act as Episcopal Electors, the clergy being appointed by the clerical members, and the laymen by the lay members of the Conference.

8.

The Electoral College shall be comprised as follows:

(1) The Archbishop and Bishops;
(2) The six clerical and six lay Episcopal Electors from the Diocese of which the See is vacant;
(3) The first three clerical and the first three lay Episcopal Electors on the list of each of the other dioceses.

The Archbishop, or in his absence the Diocesan Bishop next in order of precedence and willing to act, shall be President of the College.

18.

There shall not be a vote by Orders.

22.

If at the close of the meeting, which shall not extend beyond three consecutive days, no person shall have received two-thirds of the votes of those present and voting, the right to fill up the vacancy shall pass to the Archbishop of Canterbury, unless and until the Governing Body shall have otherwise determined. If a person receives two-thirds of the votes of those present and voting, he shall be declared by the President to be the Bishop-elect.

IV. Confirmation

25.

If the Bishop-elect accepts the appointment, the President shall send his name to each member of the Bench of Bishops, and if they or a majority of them assembled in Synod are satisfied of his fitness, the President shall take the necessary steps to give effect to the election.

26.

If the Bench of Bishops, or the majority of them, are not so satisfied of the fitness of the Bishop-elect, or if the College does not elect any person as Bishop-elect within three months of the vacancy of the See, the vacancy shall be filled up by the Archbishop of Canterbury, unless and until the Governing Body shall have otherwise determined.

CHAPTER IX

V. Election of an Archbishop

3.

The office of Archbishop shall be held by a Diocesan Bishop of the Church in Wales, to be appointed in manner hereinafter provided.

4.

The election of the Archbishop shall be by an Archbishop's Electoral College (hereinafter called the College) and constituted as hereinafter provided.

5.

The College shall be comprised as follows :

(1) The Bishops.
(2) The first three clerical and the first three lay Episcopal Electors on the list of each Diocese in the Church in Wales.

18.

If the College shall not have elected any person as Archbishop within three months of the day upon which it was first possible for them to have done so, the election shall pass to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the person elected by him shall be declared by him to be Archbishop-elect.

19.

If a person receives two-thirds of the votes of those present and voting, he shall be declared by the Bishops to be Archbishop-elect.

CHAPTER XI

VI. The Courts of the Church in Wales

89.

In the event of any charge being made against a Diocesan Bishop, the same shall be referred to a Special Provincial Court, consisting of the Archbishop and the remaining Diocesan Bishops, and the judges of the Provincial Court, of whom the Archbishop and the two Diocesan Bishops and four Judges of the Provincial Court shall form a quorum.

93.

A Bishop if found guilty by the Special Provincial Court shall have a right of appeal to the Supreme Court.

94.

In the event of any charge being made against the Archbishop, the same shall be referred to the Supreme Court consisting of the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, Armagh, and Dublin, and of the Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church, with four Assessors, nominated by the President of the Court for the time being, of whom at least two being laymen shall be members of the Special Provincial Court, provided such Assessors shall have no vote. Any of the Archbishops or the Primus may nominate any Diocesan Bishop in communion with the Church in Wales to sit in his place.

The quorum shall be four, of whom one at least shall be an Archbishop or the Primus, and the President of the Court shall be an Archbishop or the Primus.

95.

Subject to the provisions of the Constitution of the Church in Wales, the Archbishop, a Diocesan Bishop, the Provincial Court, the Special Provincial Court, and the Supreme Court, in addition to any other power, shall have power to pass sentences of monition, suspension, expulsion . . .

96.

The Bishop of the Diocese shall have power to suspend from office until the hearing and determination of a case a person in his Diocese against whom a charge is pending, and to make arrangements for carrying out the duties of such office during such suspension.

97.

The ecclesiastical law as existing in England on March 30, 1920, with the exception of:

(1) The Clergy Discipline Act, 1840,
(2) The Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874,
(3) The Clergy Discipline Act, 1892,
(4) The Pluralities Acts,
(5) The Incumbents' Resignation Acts,
(6) The Benefices Act, 1898,
(7) The Sale of Glebe Lands Act, 1888,

shall be binding on the members (including any body of members) of the Church in Wales, and shall be applied to the determination of any question or dispute between them as such members, in so far as it does not conflict with anything herein contained, or contained in the Constitution of the Church in Wales, or in any special contract as to glebe between the Representative Body and an incumbent, provided that the Courts of the Church in Wales shall not be bound by any decision of the English Courts or of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in relation to matters of Faith, Discipline and Ceremonial.

IV

(iii) THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION: SCOTLAND

By A. J. Maclean
Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness

This essay deals with the internal organisation of the Scottish Church in the period from the Revolution (1688) to the present day; that is to say, since its Disestablishment. The Church has had to build up its system of laws by very slow degrees. 'Episcopacy was ruthlessly suppressed; the bishops were deprived of the emoluments of their sees, and the clergy were ejected with scanty warning and no compensation.'[1] The process of reorganisation was greatly retarded by the penal laws which followed the Jacobite risings of 1715 and 1745; the government of the Church was for many years practically in the hands of the bishops, and, while the episcopal succession was carefully kept up, the organisation of the dioceses was but slowly developed. The bishops enacted Canons in 1727, agreed on certain articles about the arrangement of dioceses in 1731, and enacted further Canons in 1743. A presiding bishop, or Primus, was provided for; but the metropolitan powers were, as they still are, held by the bishops in common. The penal laws were repealed in 1792, though some disabilities remained till 1864.

Bishops and Clergy. Before the Revolution bishops were nominated by the Crown, as in England. From 1727 onwards, when a vacancy occurred a bishop was elected by the presbyters of the diocese (after they had received a mandate from the Primus to elect), with the assent of the comprovincial bishops. In the eighteenth century this assent was frequently refused, on what would now be considered quite insufficient grounds. In 1743 one of the presbyters of a diocese was appointed by the bishop to be ‘ dean,’ with the duty of convening his brethren for the election of a bishop.

---

[1] Historical Introduction to the Code of Canons, 1911.

In Provincial Synods (formerly called ‘ General Synods ’), which eventually had legislative powers only, the clergy did not take part until 1811, when four deans and four clerical delegates were members ; these numbers were afterwards greatly increased. Diocesan Synods, first revived in Aberdeen in 1787, were, however, frequently held for consultation between the bishop and all his clergy ; and in 1828 these were ordered to be annual. A curious arrangement was made in 1828–9, that every new law or canon enacted by the ‘ General Synod ’ must be submitted to the Diocesan Synods, and approved of by a majority of the clergy. This was later modified, as numbers increased ; but a Diocesan Synod has still the right of suggesting to the bishops subjects for legislation, though the bishops have the right of determining beforehand what subjects are to be put before the Provincial Synod. At various times it has been proposed that Provincial Synods should be quinquennial, but as a matter of fact they have, since 1829, been held only in 1838, 1862–3, 1876, 1890, 1905, 1911 and 1925–9. Episcopal Synods, consisting of all the bishops, must be held at least once a year.

The Laity. In the period covered by this essay, the first recorded official association of the laity with the bishops and clergy was at the Second Convention (of set purpose not called a ‘ Synod ’), which was held at Laurencekirk, Kincardineshire, in 1789. This Convention was called to consider the projected repeal of the penal laws. The laity were first given the right of taking part in the election of bishops in 1862–3 ; and thenceforward no person could become bishop of a diocese unless a majority of the clerical electors, and a majority of the lay electors, agreed, and then not if the comprovincial bishops, or a majority of them, refused their assent. But until 1911 only clerical electors could propose names for a bishopric. Lay communicants of a diocese have, from 1862–3 onwards, been allowed to attend the Diocesan Synod, in normal circumstances, and may speak with the bishop’s permission ; but they have no vote. At the ‘ General Synod ’ of 1862–3 lay readers and catechists were canonically recognised.

But the greatest step forward taken in the nineteenth century with regard to the laity was the institution by the Provincial Synod, in 1876, of the Representative Church Council (with Diocesan Councils in each diocese), the function of which is chiefly financial. In this Council the bishops, all the clergy, and a lay representative from each congregation meet together to discuss, not only the strictly business side of the Church's activities and the collection and distribution of money, but such subjects as home and foreign missions, social service (especially rescue, penitentiary and temperance work), and the like. Since 1911 the Council has been empowered to discuss any Church question, but with certain safeguards, such as that in making money grants, it may not enter upon the consideration of questions of doctrine or of modes of worship or of discipline. It takes the place of the old ‘ Church Society ’ instituted by the Provincial Synod of 1838. This society had done good work in its day, but its constitution was faulty, and its small grants to the clergy were too much of an eleemosynary character. By the formation of the Representative Church Council, with its annual general meetings, and its boards and committees meeting frequently, the laity have their full share in the Church's work, and there can be no doubt that it has called out a noble response from those who had felt that they were to a great extent shut out from corporate participation in ecclesiastical affairs.

The Laity and Church Legislation. It is necessary here to go back somewhat, in order to record the movement that began in 1852, with the object of giving to the laity some share in Church legislation.[1] Some might date the movement as beginning in 1824, when Bishop Hobart, of New York, visited Scotland, and in consequence of this visit some discussion on the subject took place. But in 1852 Mr. Gladstone addressed a reasoned pamphlet to the then Primus (William Skinner, Bishop of Aberdeen), advocating a Lay Chamber in the Provincial Synod, with a veto by the bishops, who alone (he urged) should initiate legislation ‘ absolutely and exclusively.’ Mr. Gladstone abstained from the discussion of ancient precedents, but dealt with the matter from the point of view of expediency and the practice of the American and Colonial Churches. The question aroused much debate in Scotland at intervals for the next half-century. Some were for giving the laity equal powers with the clergy in Church legislation ; some were totally opposed on grounds of principle and Church history to the admission of the laity into Synods at all ; but most churchmen approved of giving them some voice in making the laws of the Church, provided they did not vote in doctrinal matters. Arguments about principle and expediency were hotly brought forward ; but no solution, owing to the controversial state of the ecclesiastical atmosphere, was arrived at till the present century. At one period the ' Lay Question ' was shelved by the emergence in 1867 of the great Eucharistic Controversy, which lasted for several years. At another the ' Lay Claims ' were largely met by the institution of the Representative Church Council in 1876 ; and the question then slumbered for many years. But the real reason for the long delay may probably be found in the great difficulty of separating doctrinal from non-doctrinal matters ; for very many questions might be placed, partly in the one, and partly in the other, category. Almost all of those who took part in the discussions would whole-heartedly have given the laity a large share in legislation on non-doctrinal questions, if they could be separated from the doctrinal ones. Nor could a solution be found by saying, as some have done, that the doctrines of the Church have been laid down in the Thirty-nine Articles and the Creeds, and that therefore no question of doctrine can arise. For any proposal to alter or add a prayer, or to disuse a creed in public worship, may easily raise the whole question. Thus it took a long time for general agreement to be reached.

---

[1] Reference may be made to the excellent *History of the Lay Claims*, by the late Very Rev. G. Farquhar, Dean of St. Andrews (Dumfries, 1911).

Another matter caused a difficulty. There was no one body in which all the Scottish clergy could meet to discuss subjects for legislation or any Church matters other than those treated by the Representative Church Council ; they could meet only in seven separate Diocesan Synods, some of which are very small, and in which, therefore, it is not to be expected that all sides of a question can be presented. There was nothing in Scotland exactly like the English Convocations ; still less like the English Church Assembly of the present day. And even if laymen had been members of the Provincial Synods, the latter meet only at rare intervals. The problem, then, was, first how to solve the lay question without compelling any one to give up his fixed principles; and secondly to provide a body in which the bishops and representatives of all the clergy and laity could meet and at least talk about proposed legislation.

A revival of the discussions on the lay question took place in 1900. After various debates in conferences, in informal committees, and in the Church newspaper, during which several schemes were put forward, the Scottish bishops appointed a Commission, consisting of fifteen presbyters and fifteen laymen, to consider whether there were already adequate means for ascertaining the mind of the whole Church on subjects proposed to be dealt with by legislation in its Provincial Synod; and if not, to suggest a scheme to remedy the deficiency. The appointment met with some criticism; but the Commission held its first session early in 1903, and after eight meetings produced, in June 1904, an unanimous Report.[1] Though much difference of opinion was elicited during the debates, especially as to the best methods of reform, the Commission, by mutual concessions among its members, agreed finally on a scheme which was afterwards, in 1905, sanctioned by the Provincial Synod.

The Consultative Council. To the first question propounded to the Commission by the bishops a negative answer was unanimously returned. It was not only a question of the laity, but whether the clergy themselves had adequate means of discussing proposed legislation, seeing that they could not meet in one body before the assembling of the Provincial Synod. And, moreover, the Commission pointed out that the notice required by the then Canons with regard to proposed legislation was inadequate.

The remedy finally proposed, after the consideration of the various schemes suggested and the difficulty, already mentioned, of differentiating between doctrinal and non-doctrinal questions, was to institute a Consultative Council consisting of the bishops, with representatives of the clergy, in number about equal to that of the Second Chamber of the Provincial Synod, and representatives of the laity, of the same number, elected triennially by the clergy and laity respectively of the Diocesan Councils. These clerical representatives need not be the same as those elected to the Provincial Synod. The three Orders meet together and usually vote together, but they may, when desired, vote by Orders, and also debate by Orders. The latter permission has not yet been made use of, and the former has happened only when the more important questions have been under discussion. But the object of the scheme is that each of the three Orders may hear what the other two Orders have to say on any question, before a vote is taken. The Council is only consultative, and the Provincial Synod is not bound to carry out its decisions ; but in practice it naturally has a very great influence on the Synod. The Consultative Council may (like the Diocesan Synods) propose legislation to the bishops ; and the further procedure is that, when the Provincial Synod has made its provisional decisions, it adjourns for a somewhat lengthy period, during which the Consultative Council and the Diocesan Synods may give their opinions as to whether the provisional decisions, or any of them, should be confirmed. The Provincial Synod then meets again for the confirmation or non-confirmation of the provisional decisions, and at the confirmatory meeting the only motions competent are those to confirm or not to confirm, except that the Synod may make verbal amendments which in the opinion of both Chambers do not alter the sense. The confirmed decisions then become the law of the Church.

---

[1] Published in a large quarto volume, *The Bishops' Commission on Church Legislation. Report* (Edinburgh, 1904).

The Bishops' Commission also made suggestions for more definite notice to the various bodies named, and these suggestions were adopted by the Provincial Synod. The Commissioners in their 'Report' remark : 'The fact that (practical unanimity) has been achieved is largely due to the happy effect of a free interchange of opinion on every aspect of the questions before us. We venture to hope that, should the scheme we suggest be adopted, the same harmonious and satisfactory results may reasonably be expected in the deliberations of the proposed Consultative Council.' The experience of a quarter of a century shows that this hope has been largely fulfilled.

Congregational Organisation. A very few words may be added on this and some other matters. In each incumbency there is a local 'constitution,' agreed upon by the bishop and the congregation, to regulate matters not dealt with by the Code of Canons. It may be remarked in passing that the Code of Canons is in the Scottish Church the primary authority. The service books have authority only in so far as it is given to them by the Canons. One of the things which the local 'constitution' regulates is the patronage of that particular incumbency. The patronage in the Scottish Church is sometimes in the hands of the bishop of the diocese, rarely in that of private individuals, occasionally in that of the whole body of communicants of the congregation, and most often in that of the 'vestry' or local committee, which is usually elected by the congregation. The bishop can refuse to institute, but an appeal lies, in case of refusal, to the Episcopal Synod.

The Church Courts. The Episcopal Synod, usually assisted by a lay assessor, is the supreme Court of Appeal. In trials of bishops it acts as a Court of first instance. Priests and deacons are tried by their bishop in Diocesan Synod, with the presbyters as assessors; a lay adviser may assist the Court; an appeal either by accuser or by accused lies to the Episcopal Synod. Disputes are normally referred first to the bishop, but an appeal in most cases lies to the Episcopal Synod, or, rarely and by consent, to the Primus alone.

Such is a sketch of the present organisation of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. It will be seen that an endeavour has been made to meet the conditions of a 'constitutional episcopacy,' and to avoid autocracy on the one hand, and on the other a departure from the principles of the Catholic Church. Reference may be made, for further information, to the 'Short History of the Church in Scotland' (London, 1907), by Anthony Mitchell, D.D., who later became Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney. A more detailed work is that of Professor George Grub, 'An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland' (Edinburgh, 1861), in four volumes, now out of print. Several other histories have been written.

IV

(iv) THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION: IRELAND

By A. H. McNeile

Many words about Ireland are not here needed, since everything that is true about the doctrine of Episcopacy is true everywhere, in this country as well as in any other. But the religious life of Ireland is little known outside the island. The Church of Ireland ceased to be 'established by law' on January 1, 1871, but it is not any the less a living portion of the Body of Christ. In the Preamble to the Constitution it styles itself quite rightly 'this the Ancient Catholic and Apostolic Church of Ireland.' And its solemn declaration begins: 'The Church of Ireland doth, as heretofore, accept and unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as given by inspiration of God, and containing all things necessary to salvation; and doth continue to profess the faith of Christ as professed by the Primitive Church. (2) The Church of Ireland will continue to minister the Doctrine, and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded; and will maintain inviolate the Three Orders of Bishops, Priests or Presbyters, and Deacons in the Sacred Ministry.' Thus the similarities with the rest of the Church are many and close, and the unity of the Church of Ireland with the remainder of the Anglican Communion is carefully preserved. What needs to be done in the present essay is not to dwell on what everyone knows, but to point out some of the chief differences, from which it will be seen that, as far as the Bishops are concerned, it is by no means the 'Church of England in Ireland.'

Two facts must be remembered at the outset. In the first place, the bishops of the Church of Ireland do not stand alone, as the only episcopate in the island, but are far outnumbered by those of the Roman Catholics. In the 'South' of Ireland, *i.e.* the Free State, their population is some 92 per cent., the remaining 8 per cent. being made up of the members of the Church of Ireland together with all other religious bodies. In the 'North,' the Six Counties, the proportion of Roman Catholics is less, amounting to 41·6 per cent., the Presbyterians coming next with 31·3 per cent., the Church of Ireland having 25·8 per cent. This is largely due to the predominantly non-Roman character of Belfast, where the numbers are Presbyterians 31 per cent., the Church of Ireland a little over 30 per cent., Roman Catholics a little over 23 per cent. In the whole of Ireland taken together, the percentage of the Church of Ireland population is scarcely more than 13. If we did not believe the Episcopate to be the rightful bond of union of the whole Church of Christ, we might well feel that our tiny handful was not worth mentioning, not to speak of being made the subject of a special essay. But although we differ widely from the Roman Catholics on several doctrines and practices, refusing especially to acknowledge the papal claims, we are nevertheless certain, however long it may be before they admit the validity of our Orders, that their many bishops, like our few, can claim (leaving out of account their elusive doctrine of Intention) lines of succession which do not, of course, give them jurisdiction in Ireland but make them 'apostolic' leaders of the Church. That while the 13 per cent. who count themselves to belong to the Church of Ireland admit the valid ordination of the bishops of 66 per cent., the admission is not mutual, is unfortunate, and constitutes one of our chief difficulties. But the fact remains that they are true bishops, and that when we say 'I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church,' we are speaking of something which is as much in evidence and flourishing here as anywhere. And to make clear the smallness of the Church of Ireland compared with the Roman Catholic Church is to give a reason for the bitterness and narrow-mindedness which are too often in evidence. The small and dwindling body is always ready armed to defend its very existence.

'Catholics' and 'Protestants' (as they are popularly known) are ranged against each other, and many on either side make not the slightest attempt to understand the other's point of view. Add to that the fact that the religious differences were, until recently, intensified by age-long political antagonisms, and one can still more easily explain the bitterness and narrow-mindedness.

The other thing to be remembered, and one which is seldom grasped outside Ireland, is that while the country has been politically divided into two, the Free State and the Six Counties, the former having its own coinage and stamps and army and government, yet the Church of Ireland is not divided at all. The Six Counties do not coincide with dioceses; the Border cuts in two, for instance, the diocese of Armagh and only the diocese of Down, Connor and Dromore is wholly within the Six Counties. Occasions arise from time to time when it is a temptation to split the Church. Belfast, which spreads into two dioceses, has by far the largest Church of Ireland population of any town in the island. And she in the Northern area, and Dublin in the Free State, would both, at times, love to have the pre-eminence in the Church. But we are thankful that hitherto no division has been seriously proposed. We cannot help remembering that it was political considerations which helped to lead to the claims of the papacy. And it is all to the good that the primatial diocese of Armagh is cut in two by the Border; it prevents either part from having an ecclesiastical advantage. It is important to do everything possible to maintain community of interests, and to preserve the struggling Church of Ireland from being divided against itself, than which nothing would please our opponents more.

To leave preliminaries and come to the arrangement of bishops. Each diocese has its own bishop as in England, but our numbers are not large enough to warrant the appointment of suffragans. The island is divided into two provinces, under Armagh and Dublin respectively, as England is under Canterbury and York. Geographically it is the converse of England, the more important province of Armagh being the Northern and that of Dublin the Southern. Here as there every precaution is taken to ensure that the Archbishop of Armagh is not a kind of Pope, but *primus inter pares.*

But in the regulations connected with his appointment Ireland is probably unique. One to be chosen archbishop must, ordinarily, have previously been a bishop of some other diocese; and he is elected by the Bench of Bishops from among their own number. But they do not go on to fill his place as bishop. On the occurrence of a vacancy in the See of Armagh, the Diocesan Synod of Armagh elect a bishop in the same way as any other bishop (which will be explained in a moment) unless they have already elected two out of the existing thirteen on the Bench. But he bears the interim title of bishop-elect of Armagh. He does not, however, thereby become archbishop. Of that there is little chance unless he has previously been the bishop of some other diocese. The archbishop, as has been said, is elected by the Bench of Bishops from among their own number. And when they have elected one, the 'bishop-elect of Armagh' (unless it is the Archbishop of Dublin that has been taken to be Archbishop of Armagh) goes to that diocese from which the bishop has been taken to be archbishop. In this case, therefore, some diocese gets a bishop who has not been chosen by itself, as if it had disagreed within itself in the choice (a circumstance which will be explained immediately), and he is quite possibly not the man that the majority of the diocese would have chosen. When, however, it is the Archbishop of Dublin that is transferred to Armagh, the joint synods of Dublin, Glendalough and Kildare elect their own bishop (in this case their own archbishop) in the ordinary way.

The Church of Ireland has the two archbishops and eleven other bishops. (There are also retired bishops, who are, of course, supernumerary, and exercise no government in the Church.) But the fact of having thirteen bishops does not mean that the Church of Ireland is divided into thirteen dioceses. It consists of no fewer than twenty-five. But the troublous times through which the island has passed, and other causes, have led to the gradual depletion of her numbers, which has gone on to such an extent that there has been necessary, not only a widespread amalgamation of parishes, but a combination of dioceses. Glendalough and Kildare, for instance, are joined to Dublin ; Ferns and Leighlin (pronounced Lochlin) to Ossory, and so on. Each of these united dioceses is allowed to retain its own constitution, its own cathedral, its own officials except the bishop. So that there is a large number of deans per head of the Church of Ireland population ; and the canons are as the sand which is on the seashore, innumerable. (It is true, however, that there has been some movement towards reducing the numbers of these.)

The Church of Ireland is disestablished. Many were the anxious fears for its continuation apart from the State. But the policy has proved a triumphant success. Both internally, and as evidenced by the results of mission work abroad, the Church in general, both clergy and laity, has shown a growing earnestness and devotion—an earnestness and devotion that often take by surprise those that come from England and other countries. And it is much more alive, in spite of its diminishing numbers, than it was before the disestablishment. (Disestablishment carried with it disendowment, it is true. It is scarcely possible to bring about the one without the other. But with that we are not here concerned. Those who want to learn what a small Church can do with its money can see the main facts lucidly set out in Canon Connell's booklet on ' The Finances of the Church of Ireland,' one of the series, ' Penny Pamphlets for Irish Churchmen.'[1]) We have the great advantage of choosing our bishops without the helping hand of the Prime Minister, who may or may not be a Churchman, or even a Christian.

The method of election, in which laymen play a considerable part, must now be considered. When a bishopric is vacant, the Diocesan Synod (of which more hereafter) votes for one or more persons, not exceeding three, except in the case mentioned above in which a bishop (other than the Archbishop of Dublin) has been chosen to be an archbishop. The clergy and laity in the Synod here vote separately. ' The names of the three persons who shall have obtained the largest number of the votes of clerical members, and the names of the three persons who shall have obtained the largest number of the votes of lay members, shall be placed on a Select List.' Then the two Orders vote separately again for one of these six (or less), and if any person obtains two-thirds of the clerical and of the lay votes separately, he is thereupon declared elected. If not, and if on a repeated vote some person obtains the required majority of the votes of one Order, but only a plain majority of the other, his name is submitted for a further and final voting. If he then obtains the required majority, he is declared elected. If not—as frequently happens, *i.e.* in something like half the cases—the duty of election passes to the Bench of Bishops, but they do not possess the right claimed by the Crown in England of presentation for that time to the vacated benefice. If the Synod has elected someone, the election is confirmed by the bishops, provided that they are satisfied as to the fitness of the elected person.

---

[1] Obtainable from the A.P.C.K. (Association for Promoting Christian Knowledge), 37 Dawson Street, Dublin.

Laymen thus have an important part (except in the case of Armagh) in the responsibility of choosing their own bishops. But they have been given, in general, a large share in determining the life of the Church of Ireland. We are here concerned with two others of their activities, which are more far-reaching than is allowed in the Church of England.

The first of these is the influence that they possess in the presentation to a benefice. The bishop appoints 'curates-in-charge,' but not vicars or rectors (between the two latter there is no difference in the Church of Ireland). Every Diocesan Synod elects one of its lay and two of its clerical members to be, together with the bishop, the 'Committee of Patronage' for the diocese. And the 'registered vestrymen' of each parish triennially elect three others, all of whom must be laymen, who are called 'Parochial Nominators.' These six, with the bishop presiding, form a 'Board of Nomination,' provided that if they fail to propose a name to the bishop within three months, the appointment lapses to him. Private or trustee patronage—for one presentation only—is possible, but the arrangements of it are very carefully safeguarded. The arrangements must be 'approved by the

Bishop, by the Diocesan Council, by at least four members of the Board, in addition to the Bishop, including not less than two of the Parochial Nominators, and by the Vestry.' The institution of the person nominated to be incumbent is governed by the following regulation : 'The Bishop shall forthwith institute the Clergyman nominated as above prescribed, if satisfied of his fitness ; or in case he may decline to do so, he shall give to him, if so required, his reasons in writing for so declining.' A clergyman ('curate-in-charge') may be licensed by the bishop to serve where there is no parish church, except where someone has 'erected, appropriated, or endowed' the building used for worship, in which case the patronage may be vested in a trustee or trustees sanctioned by the bishop, the Diocesan Synod, and the Representative Church Body (*i.e.* the Body to which is entrusted the money of the Church).

It will be seen from what has been said that the power of laymen in Ireland in selecting someone for the cure of souls is great. The laymen of different parishes are naturally in communication with each other, and anyone can go and listen to a sermon from a likely man, or see, as well as hear, how he takes a service. And the faintest alteration in doctrine or ceremonial from that to which they have been accustomed may constitute a fatal bar. A rumour of churchmanship of a certain type will stop his promotion for the rest of his life, or so long as he remains in Ireland. What can be said is that the parish, or at any rate the parochial nominators, mostly get the sort of incumbent that they like. The result of this is peace in the Church of Ireland as a whole. There is, to a certain extent, a uniformity which enables its members (or most of them) to find, wherever they go, a service which they can appreciate. There are almost no quarrels regarding doctrines preached or ceremonial practised, because both are kept within close limits by law. There is a friendliness and community of interests among the clergy which other countries might well envy. It is with tantalising slowness, in consequence, that the Church of Ireland moves. *E pur se muove.* It is surely, though not too quickly, progressing, and it is fatal to hurry it. The difference that the last ten years have seen is very noticeable ;

and what the condition of things must have been before the disestablishment, sixty years ago, is difficult to realise.

A second important direction in which laymen can exercise enormous influence in the Church of Ireland is that of government. This they do through the Synods. There is no Provincial Synod, as there is no Convocation and no House of Laymen. But there are two bodies which govern the Church—the Diocesan Synods and the General Synod. Within strictly defined limits the bishops possess, each in his own diocese, the authority of an ordinary. Needless to say, they alone possess the episcopal powers of the laying on of hands for confirmation and for ordination, the other prerogatives being delegated, as everywhere else, to presbyters. But in matters of government they are largely overshadowed by the Synods.

The Diocesan Synods, as their name implies, are gatherings within each diocese for its own self-government. Even when two or more dioceses have been combined under one bishop, as they are combined under ten of the thirteen bishops, each Synod may, if it likes, sit separately. It consists of the bishop as its chairman, the beneficed and licensed clergy of the diocese, and normally two laymen to every such clergyman, being not less than twenty-one years of age, and having declared themselves members of the Church of Ireland, to state which they must sign a declaration. Every Diocesan Synod 'may exercise all such powers and make such regulations as to the temporalities pertaining to the diocese' as it may deem necessary.

Thus while a bishop is always supreme as regards strictly episcopal powers, his authority in the government of his diocese is reduced to a minimum. He is always listened to with respect by virtue of his office, and if he is a man of force and character he can get things done that he wants, but at any time his Synod, some two-thirds of which are laymen, can oppose and outvote him. The most that he can do is to hold up a measure of which he disapproves, as the two following regulations provide : 'Ch. 2, 31. If a majority of the Clergy and of the Synodsmen present shall be in favour of any Resolution or Motion, the Bishop or other President may take reasonable time, not exceeding one month, to consider whether he will assent to or dissent from the same. 32. In case the Bishop dissent from the other two Orders, with respect to any proposed act of the Synod, all action thereupon shall be suspended until the next annual meeting of the Synod ; and should such act be then re-affirmed by two-thirds of each of the other Orders, present and voting, and the Bishop still dissent, it shall be submitted to the General Synod, whose decision shall be final : Provided always, that where any act has been affirmed by a majority of each Order, it shall be competent for the Bishop to refer the question to the next General Synod for decision.'

But while Diocesan Synods can manage the temporalities of a diocese, the last authority on everything that it takes into its hands, to which appeal on almost any and every matter can be made, is the General Synod. The thirteen bishops sit with 216 representatives of the clergy and 432 of the laity, a quorum being 2, 30, and 60 of them respectively. Clergymen and laymen, who make up this number, are allotted to each see according to a schedule, the laymen being not less than twenty-one years of age, and having declared themselves members of the Church of Ireland. They are elected at an annual meeting of the Synod to serve for three years. Serious changes, such as changes in the Constitution, or in any of the Canons, or in the ' articles, doctrines, rites, rubrics,' are extremely difficult, since ' every proposed Statute or Canon shall be introduced as a Bill,' and ' no Bill shall be introduced except on leave given by a Resolution passed in full Synod,' and there is good precedent for reading a Bill three times. Moreover a Bill, or a Resolution to accept a Bill, to change ' articles, doctrines, rites, rubrics ' can pass only by majorities of two-thirds of the clerical and lay representatives voting separately. The power in the General Synod retained by the bishops is seen in the following regulations : ' If at any time the Bishops express their wish to consider separately any matter in debate, the further discussion of that matter shall be postponed until the Bishops shall have had the opportunity of so doing.' And the next regulation (No. 22) begins : ' The Bishops shall vote separately from the Representatives, and no question shall be deemed to have been carried unless there be in its favour a majority of the Bishops present, if they desire to vote.' Once more, the following regulation lays down that 'The Bishops shall not vote until after the declaration of the votes of the Clerical and Lay Representatives. If they desire to vote, the Bishops may withdraw from the General Synod for that purpose, and may reserve the declaration of their vote until the next day of meeting.' But even the privileges of the bishops in the General Synod are not without their limitations. Regulation No. 22 ends with these words: 'Provided always, that if a question affirmed by a majority of the Clerical and Lay Representatives voting conjointly or by Orders, but in favour of which there shall not be a majority of the Bishops, shall be re-affirmed at the next Ordinary Session of the General Synod, by not less than two-thirds of the Clerical and Lay Representatives, voting conjointly or by Orders, it shall be deemed to be carried, unless it be negatived by not less than two-thirds of the then entire existing Order of Bishops, the said two-thirds being present and voting, and giving their reasons in writing.'

It will be seen that the General Synod is a mixed body which the bishops must obey. It 'shall have power to control, alter, repeal, or supersede any regulation made by a Diocesan Synod, so far as may be necessary to provide against the admission of any principle inexpedient for the common interest of the Church'; also 'to make general regulations as to how and by whom all patronage shall be exercised; and generally to make all such regulations as may be necessary for the order, good government, and efficiency of the Church of Ireland.'

But the chief check on the disciplinary authority of a bishop lies in the 'Court of the General Synod.' It is constituted in three different ways, according to the work that it has before it. The cases with which we are chiefly concerned in this essay are those of 'any charge involving a question of Doctrine or Ritual or the deposition from Holy Orders of any clergyman.' In such cases the Court consists of three ecclesiastical and four lay judges, the former of whom are bishops, and none of the seven may be a member of it if it hears of any appeal from the Court of his own diocese. 'Every charge involving any question of Doctrine or Ritual shall be cognisable by the Court of the General Synod,' and if not promoted by a bishop, shall be preferred by at least four male communicants, who have signified in writing their submission to the authority of the General Synod. And the form in which they must make their charge is annexed to the chapter in which the regulation in question occurs. 'The decision of the said Court as to whether the case is one involving any question of Doctrine or Ritual shall be conclusive.' Before the case can be tried, it is true, a commission of inquiry, consisting of not less than one clergyman and one layman, is nominated by the archbishop of the province. And if after the report of the commission the archbishop and two lay judges 'shall consider the charge to be vague or frivolous, or that a *prima facie* case has not been established, they shall stay all further proceedings upon the petition.' But still, the control of a bishop over one of his own clergy in a matter of doctrine or ritual can be set at nought by any four male communicants who are ready to declare to the Court that on or about a certain date, in the parish of A, in the diocese of B, they heard the clergyman say so-and-so, on the doctrine of which the Court, with its lay judges, is considered competent to decide, or saw him do something which the Court rules to be a contravention of the law of the Church of Ireland. Doctrine is, as a matter of fact, rendered safer by the provision, in the case in question, that 'the concurrence of two at least of the Ecclesiastical Judges shall be requisite for a judgment adverse to the Clergyman charged, and, in every such case, the sentence shall be pronounced by one of the Ecclesiastical Judges.'

While our bishops, therefore, possess intact the spiritual powers pertaining to their office, yet in matters of discipline, which include matters of doctrine and ritual, their authority is far from final. That authority lies ultimately in binding laws, so tightly framed that lawyers themselves cannot explain them away by any subtle 'interpretations.' Their rigidity prevents serious quarrels or wide differences of opinion in the Church of Ireland, and leaves room for its spiritual fervour, and its earnest desire to win souls, but it is very rigid.

IV

(v) THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION: THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

By E. L. Parsons, Bishop of California

'I THINK you have too much circumscribed the power of your Bishop.' Thus writes Seabury of Connecticut, the first bishop of the Anglican Communion in America, to the leaders of the Church in Pennsylvania and Maryland. His comment is upon a plan of organisation for the Church in America which is to be proposed at a Convention called to meet in Philadelphia in the autumn of 1785. He protests that there is no recognition whatever of the precedence and authority which have always belonged to the office of bishop. A bishop in this new and democratic country is to be *ex officio* a member of the General Convention of the Church; but he will sit with presbyters and laymen, undistinguished among them.

Bishop Seabury's protest indicates the line of cleavage that existed among the scattered and unorganised groups which up to the War of Independence had had a tenuous relationship with one another and an almost formless ecclesiastical life under the distant governance of the Bishop of London. After the war began they were free. But they were headless, without organisation, in some states emerging from a quasi-establishment, in others existing merely under sufferance. The leaders were of one mind in seeking the unity of the Church in the infant nation and they all agreed that bishops were needed. But at that point differences began to arise.

Seabury was a moderate High Churchman. He believed that bishops were necessary to the Church. He believed with the clergy of Connecticut and New England in general that the most important step upon the conclusion of peace was the securing of the Episcopal succession. Chosen by the Connecticut clergy, he had gone to England seeking consecration. Legal difficulties prevented the otherwise willing archbishops from acceding at once to the petition from America, and Seabury had gone to Aberdeen. There he was consecrated by the non-juring bishops. He returned to America with a very definite conception of his office. He was not only a High Churchman. He was a Tory in politics, had been a chaplain in the British army during the war, and had little sympathy with the republican enthusiasm which animated most of the clergy in the States to the south of Connecticut. He had been elected by the clergy alone. He looked upon lay participation in the affairs of the Church with suspicion. He expected to rule the Church in Connecticut with his presbyters acting as a council.

His mistrust of the position taken by White of Pennsylvania, Smith of Maryland, and the other leaders in the south was deepened by his remembrance of a pamphlet published in 1782 before peace had been concluded and known to have been written by Dr. White. This pamphlet presented the first sketch of those provisions for Church government which were embodied in the ‘ General Ecclesiastical Constitution ’ of 1789. But in addition to the outline of a scheme of representative Church government, in which bishops were regarded primarily as executives, this pamphlet proposed that on account of the practical impossibility of securing the episcopate from England (peace had not yet been made) and the urgent necessity of taking some steps to prevent the utter disintegration of what was left of the Church of England in America, the districts or dioceses into which the Church was to be divided should choose presiding presbyters who should exercise episcopal functions until the succession could be secured. Although White believed that the doctrine of the divine right of bishops was as little tenable as that of kings and supported his proposal by copious reference to great English divines, it was nevertheless an interim policy. He never questioned the importance of the regular succession and was more than satisfied when, peace having been consummated, the way slowly opened to obtain it.

White was determined, however, that the Church should be organised with due regard for those principles of representative government which were at the moment being gradually expressed in state and national constitutions. He had been Chaplain of Congress. He was intimate with men like Franklin, Hamilton and Madison. Furthermore, he had seen that the laity during the long years without adequate governance had taken positions of leadership and responsibility in ecclesiastical affairs. Their place must be assured in the councils of the Church.

Seabury's protest was nevertheless not unavailing. The Convention of 1785, which included no representatives from New England, had accepted the proposal that bishops should have a seat but no place of precedence. It had given the State (Diocesan) Conventions jurisdiction in the trial of a clergyman of any order. At an adjourned meeting the next year, however, Bishop Seabury's views were reinforced by a brotherly but firm letter from the English bishops to whom had been sent the request for consecration of bishops for America. They felt that in all this matter they must be 'extremely cautious lest we (they) should be the instruments of establishing an ecclesiastical system which will be called a branch of the Church of England but afterwards may possibly appear to have departed from it essentially either in doctrine or in discipline.' At a later adjourned meeting the reply of the English archbishops expressly mentioned the provision in regard to the trial of a clergyman as being 'a degradation of the clerical and still more the episcopal character.' As a result the provisions of the proposed constitution were modified. A bishop, if one was present, should preside in General Convention; and in the trial of a bishop another bishop should always be present and only a bishop should pronounce sentence. Three years later when New England was represented, when Seabury was present and unity had been won, the bishops were constituted a separate House. There were then three, White and Provoost having been consecrated at Lambeth on

February 4, 1787. The House of Bishops would have power to propose legislation, but its veto on legislation enacted by the House of Deputies was not conclusive. It could be overridden by a three-fifths majority of the House of Deputies. This was later changed to four-fifths, and in 1792 the House of Bishops was given the full veto.

It seems quite clear that in the various changes in the power given the House of Bishops we have the record of a real change in the conception of the place of that House in the government of the Church. Following the analogy of the national and state constitutions, most of the dioceses were being organised with conventions in which, while the clergy and laity sat together, they voted separately. The bishop presided. He was the executive. And the Convention was in voting a bi-cameral legislature. This principle was transferred to the General Convention and the House of Bishops was regarded not as a co-ordinate legislative body, but as a kind of corporate executive.

But corporate executives rarely work. The facts were too much for the theory. In most American dioceses the bishop still has, like the Executive of a State or the President of the United States in legislative matters, a veto, seldom if ever exercised, on constitutional changes. But the House of Bishops has become a co-ordinate legislative body and, since on important matters clergy and laity vote by orders, we have really a tri-cameral legislature.

But while the legislation gradually worked out removed all trace of 'degradation' of the episcopate, there is no question that the political principles which were taking form in state and nation guided the thought and action of the Church. The bishop might govern but he might not rule. He was the executive but with well-defined powers. The Catholic tradition was, of course, not repudiated. The bishop was chief pastor in his diocese, and it seems to have been understood that the canon law of the Church of England, where not distinctly superseded by constitutional or canonical legislation, was the law of the Church. It held ecclesiastically the place which the common law of England held in the civil courts. Bishop, rector, wardens, vestrymen—their places in the economy of the Church were fixed by tradition before they were modified by statute. But the modifications were obviously framed to bring the powers of bishops into harmony with the prevailing political principles. The Church intended to leave no place for the exercise of arbitrary power. It was distinctly not interested in enhancing the prestige of the office.

Economic and social conditions contributed to the same end. It is not easy for institutions to outgrow the habits and lessons of a century or more. From 1607 to 1784 the Church in America had been little more than a loose aggregation of parishes. The importance of the parish and of the laymen who for the most part formed the permanent element in it was therefore greatly heightened. Parish life and parish connections were all that was known to the average Churchman. When the time for organisation came it was effected, quite contrary to the tradition of the Church, from the bottom up. Bishops came not as apostles to found but as elected executives to guide. They brought with them the power to ordain and confirm, but even the power of ordination must be exercised under carefully framed regulations and with the concurrence of the laity.

Furthermore, there were no material adjuncts to the office of bishop which could give it any great prestige. There were no endowments, no palaces, no titles, no civic privileges. So poor was the Church that it was taken for granted that the bishop must be the rector of a parish, else he would be without support. White in Philadelphia, Seabury in New London, Provoost in New York, merely added certain episcopal functions to the responsibilities which they held in their parishes. These parishes were in no sense cathedrals. That was a development which, as we shall see, came later.

Nor was there any social prestige attached to the office, except perhaps in a few very restricted circles. The hostility which had led, for example, the Massachusetts legislature in 1768 to protest formally against bishops had vanished with independence. It had been chiefly due to the fear that, English law being operative, bishops would in some way be officers of the state. That fear gone, no one objected to bishops coming in, but on the other hand no one outside the Church really cared whether they came or not. The Church was weak. It had not more than 25,000 communicants. In New England its few parishes counted very little as against the established Congregationalism. In New York it was stronger, but the Dutch tradition there was Presbyterian. Pennsylvania was a Quaker community. Only in Maryland, Virginia, and farther south, had the Church of England been in any sense established. Even in the Church itself there was much frankly expressed indifference. South Carolina at first proposed coming into the union with the express provision that it should not be required to have a bishop. Delaware had none until 1841. Indeed, it is quite clear that Seabury spoke justly when he wrote, ‘ A bishop in Connecticut must in some degree be of the primitive style.’ What was true in Connecticut was true throughout the land.

In some such fashion episcopacy in the Anglican Communion began in America. In spite of the concessions to Seabury's principles, the powers of bishops were very definitely circumscribed by constitutional enactment. Still more were their powers circumscribed by the conditions under which they worked. The result was that, after the important principles of unity and polity were settled, these early bishops could give little active leadership.

A generation passed and change set in. The old-fashioned type of bishop began to disappear. Men like Hobart in New York, Griswold in New England, Moore in Virginia, interpreted in varied ways the responsibilities of their office ; but all conceived of it as apostolic. All were men sent. All assumed that to be bishop meant to be a leader, builder, missionary. There came no essential changes in the constitutional limitations of the bishop's power. The Church and the bishops settled down to full acceptance of the principle of lay participation in government. But the influence of a number of dynamic personalities like those mentioned above during the second and third generations of Church life moved powerfully to change the scope of a bishop's responsibility and to increase not his canonical but his personal authority. That movement has, as we shall see, gone steadily on. Indeed there are many thoughtful Churchmen who fear lest it has gone too far. They may take comfort, however, in the fact that as yet there has been no effort of any kind to alter constitutional provisions in the interest of episcopal autocracy.

With the new emphasis in the bishop's office and work came also the appearance of 'Missionary Bishops' whose constitutional status differed both in manner of election and in relation to the House of Bishops and to their own districts and dioceses from that of diocesan bishops. Philander Chase went out to the new Ohio country in 1817, and two years later his ardent missionary labours had created a diocese of which he was consecrated first bishop in 1819. He was the first missionary bishop in the sense of one who went out to create and build up. Other diocesan bishops, like Otey of Tennessee a century ago, and Whipple of Minnesota in the last generation, have been essentially missionaries. They have had to start at the beginning and create. But in 1835 General Convention established the missionary episcopate by title. A missionary bishop was and is elected by the House of Bishops and confirmed by the House of Deputies, or by the Standing Committees of the dioceses acting for General Convention. Under that provision Jackson Kemper was immediately consecrated and sent out to the vast territory of the north-west. He was the first in a long line of pioneers whose work has enriched the records of Christian missions. Kemper and Scott, Tuttle and Hare, Whittaker and Talbot, and in our own time Brent in the Philippines and Rowe[1] in Alaska, are names which spring to mind. They travelled on horseback and in stage coach; they preached in saloons and theatres and on the streets; they braved blizzards in the north and defied the waterless deserts in the south. Under their leadership churches were established, priests gave themselves to frontier tasks, and, as the population grew, missionary districts gave place to dioceses. Kemper alone saw seven dioceses established in the great territory to which he went first as missionary bishop.

---

[1] The eminence of Bishop Rowe's missionary work in Alaska has seemed to justify departure from the rule of mentioning by name no living American bishops.

The frontier is gone now. Automobiles and railroads have superseded horses and stage-coaches ; but through the mountain backbone of the country and in the north-west and south-west there are still fifteen great missionary districts with a Church population too scattered and small for self-support. Their bishops are still missionaries, men sent to spread the Gospel and build up the Church.

It is in the fact that he is sent by the whole Episcopal Church in America that the missionary bishop differs from the diocesan. Otherwise he has equal privileges in the Church and in the House of Bishops. He is the ecclesiastical authority in his own district and really exercises more complete control than a diocesan bishop. On the other hand he is subject to transfer by the House of Bishops, which has a kind of indirect responsibility for his work. These provisions all apply equally to the missionary bishops sent out to foreign lands.

It became apparent very early in the life of the Church that provision must be made to assist those bishops who, through the infirmities of age or illness, were unable to exercise their office. Without any special provision of the constitution, four dioceses had chosen assistant bishops but, except in the case of Maryland in 1814, the succession had been secured to these assistants. In 1827, however, the diocese of Virginia had elected Dr. Meade as assistant bishop, his tenure of office to cease at the death of the diocesan. The General Convention, when asked to pronounce judgment on his credentials, decided in view of the urgency of the need in Virginia to act favourably, and Bishop Meade was consecrated ; but the Convention most emphatically put on record its disapproval of Virginia's action, assumed that that diocese in view of the Convention's disapproval would ensure Bishop Meade's succession, and immediately adopted legislation providing that assistant bishops might be elected, but always with the right of succession. In 1895 the title was changed to Bishop-Coadjutor. During the last twenty or thirty years, owing to the growing pressure of our American life, the number of coadjutors has rapidly increased.

The position of the coadjutor is not really that of an assistant. He has all the privileges of a diocesan bishop except eligibility to the office of Presiding Bishop ; the succession is assured him and the assignment of his duties by the diocesan has to be made in the call for his election and cannot be altered except by mutual consent. His authority within his own sphere of duties is complete and, while he cannot shape diocesan policies as a whole, his participation in such shaping is essential. Indeed, the implication of the constitution that the coadjutor is not a bishop with jurisdiction is often practically inaccurate. Where for example a bishop assigns to the coadjutor the charge of the parishes and missions of the diocese, reserving to himself only, let us say, the care of the institutions, of candidates for orders and the like, it means that the coadjutor becomes the executive of the diocese, and that the clergy are placed under his charge. Their appeal is to him and not to the diocesan bishop. He becomes the ecclesiastical authority for policy and discipline within the range of his own assignment. The same holds in a case like that of the huge diocese of Montana, where the eastern half of the state is under the jurisdiction of the coadjutor.

But whatever the scope of his responsibility, the intent of constitution and canons is clear. The coadjutor is not to be an assistant to whom from time to time the bishop will assign duties, but rather an associate with independence in his own sphere.

As the last century grew old and the urban population increased everywhere, the Church discovered that the provision of coadjutors failed altogether to relieve the strain upon the bishops of some of the great dioceses like New York and Pennsylvania. Not only might more than one assistant be needed ; but also if the bishop happened to be in the prime of life—possibly even on what is quite mistakenly called the sunny side of fifty—it was fair neither to the diocese nor to the assistant to make him coadjutor. A diocese should hardly be bound to choose a successor to its bishop twenty years in advance ; nor an assistant be asked to tie himself irrevocably to a position which in the circumstances suggested might turn out very difficult to fill. The alternatives left were the division of the great city dioceses or the provision of suffragan bishops. The former was contrary to both Catholic tradition and good policy. The Church after long debate turned to the latter.

The decision to do so was greatly hastened by the pressure of the race problem in the south. Proposals had been made that negro missionary bishops be elected, their jurisdiction being racial rather than territorial—proposals which have within the last few months been revived by some of the representative leaders of the south. One cannot forecast what the Church may do with them now ; but in the first decade of this century they could not command approval. On the other hand it seemed as if a negro suffragan acting as such, if desired, not only to the bishop for whose diocese he had been elected but for others, would at any rate be a help in the right direction. In 1910 the adoption of legislation authorising not more than two suffragans in a diocese apparently brought to an end an agitation which had for fifty years found expression in proposals presented to General Convention.

But it was only in appearance. The suffragan did not have the right of succession ; but he was eligible not only for his own diocese but for any other. In the latter provision he secured a freedom which the coadjutor did not possess, at the cost of the loss of a privilege. But since he did not possess even the limited jurisdiction of the coadjutor, on the theory that membership in the House of Bishops is really based on jurisdiction, he was given a seat but not a vote in that House. But there is another theory and a more ancient one. A bishop because he is a bishop should have every privilege (in a matter of this kind) which belongs to any member of his order. Furthermore, as a merely practical consideration, it is said the suffragans are all in active work, are in close touch with the life of the Church, and on any theory which seeks adequate representation should be recognised.

And so it comes about that every three years as General Convention meets the suffragan bishop question comes up for discussion. Whether the suffragans will ultimately be given a vote no one can tell. But in the meanwhile the suffragans in the great dioceses have gone on with their work, rendering immensely valuable service and presumably little troubled by the discussion of their status.

One cannot speak so unqualifiedly of the success of the system in helping to solve the racial problem. The few negro suffragans have done admirably the work assigned them. That is all to the good. But the problem of the adjustment of the races is thorny, complex, utterly resistant to any compact and simple formula. Of course, the question of the episcopate is only one small part of it. About all that one can say is that in that respect the Church has made a good beginning.

Constitutional and Canonical. The rapid sketch given above of the beginnings of the episcopate in America and its development under the pressure of social and economic conditions has also revealed a good deal of the constitutional and canonical form of the structure which the Church has built up. We turn now to a somewhat more careful appraisal of the position of the bishop to-day, his powers and rights, and the manner in which the legislation of the Church has 'circumscribed' them, as Bishop Seabury feared.

In the election of a bishop the laity have everywhere a direct share. In most dioceses this is by concurrent vote. The two 'orders' sit together. Nominations are made and a majority vote in both 'orders' (the laity voting by parishes) is necessary to a choice. In eight dioceses the clergy elect and the laity confirm, the simplest method of giving the laity a voice in the matter. There are obvious practical advantages either way. But the concurrent vote seems to have commended itself theoretically as giving the laity a more equal share in the choice and practically as making a disagreement between the two 'orders' less unpleasant for the candidates. Neither system avoids deadlocks nor the difficulties incident to securing a majority. Now and then after balloting many times a convention will adjourn to meet weeks or months later and try again. It is generally assumed that there is a vast amount of 'politics' in these elections. Sometimes there is ; and it must be admitted that now and then, when partisanship has for the moment obscured the common ideals of Churchmen, conventions have been reminiscent rather of some of the early Councils of the Church than of a group of Christian leaders. When High Church and Low Church were struggling a hundred years ago, or 'ritualism' was disturbing the Church fifty years later, conventions could hardly be free from reminders of what was going on. But on the whole the Church in America has no cause to be ashamed of the way in which its representative assemblies have done their work, nor, so far as the election of bishops is concerned, of their product.

It is widely assumed also that popular elections of this kind give us very mediocre bishops, that *safe* men preponderate and that real leaders are overlooked. Modesty might perhaps suggest that in an essay of this kind such comment should be ignored, and yet such comment furnishes a good opportunity to recall the great number of real and very powerful leaders who have adorned the American episcopate. Some of the outstanding missionary leaders have already been named. Add to them White and Hobart, Moore of Virginia, Coxe of Western New York and Wilmer of Alabama, Hopkins of Vermont and McIlvaine of Ohio, Clark of Rhode Island and Williams of Connecticut, Alonzo and Henry Potter, Phillips Brooks, Charles D. Williams, Spalding and Brent. It is a striking list and at least a suggestion that in America the Church is not afraid of vigorous and even radical leadership. It is true that there have been few great scholars among the American bishops and few leaders of thought whose influence has reached widely outside the Episcopal Church. But that has been inevitable. American Church life has called for administrative capacity, for practical ability, for foundation laying. It has given small opportunity for the development of scholarship. Leisure is just beginning to be sought and valued. Endowments are few. The pressure of affairs has increasingly interfered with the slow-ripening processes of thought. Practically every American clergyman must be a parish priest, and eminence will ordinarily be won not by specialisation but by that happy combination of varied qualities which parish life demands. Bishops come ordinarily from the parish clergy. Their characteristics will be typical of the everyday life of parish clergy in America.

But enough *apologia!* Election of bishops by dioceses has some disadvantages from which nomination by the Crown does not suffer. But we have no Crown; and on the whole we seem to do pretty well through the representatives of the clergy and people.

If the diocese which elects has not done well, the Church has reserved the right to say so. Every election must be confirmed either by General Convention or, if as is usual it takes place more than three months before the triennial meeting of that body, by the Bishops of the Church and the Standing Committees of the dioceses. This confirmation is for the most part purely perfunctory. A Standing Committee in Texas is likely to have little knowledge of a presbyter elected in New England. A bishop has somewhat more ready access to information, but nevertheless the committee or the bishop ordinarily acts *pro forma.* There are very few cases in which confirmation has not been given. The best known is perhaps that of the distinguished leader of the Tractarians two generations ago, James De Koven. In 1874 he was elected Bishop of Illinois. On purely theological grounds the election was not confirmed. Dr. De Koven died soon after. It is probable that had he lived he would soon have been chosen for some other diocese and the Church would have reversed its decision. For it is not always recalled that Dr. George F. Seymour had a few months previously suffered the same treatment on his election to the same diocese. His rejection is forgotten because in 1878 he was confirmed as Bishop of Springfield. It was he in turn who led the futile effort in 1892 to defeat the confirmation of Phillips Brooks as Bishop of Massachusetts. Such effort is, however, very rare. It is rightly assumed that a diocese knows its own mind and has a right to exercise its own judgment. The Church will interfere only in case of some grievous mistake on the part of the diocese or through some grievous mistake of its own.

The Bishop's Authority. When the bishop enters upon his work he finds himself, as *mutatis mutandis* he would anywhere else in the Christian world, possessed of three kinds of authority: that which is carefully defined in the canons of General Convention and his own diocese, that which is vaguely known as 'inherent,' and that which springs solely from his own personal character and ability. His constitutional power is distinctly limited. He is still what the fathers of the Church in America intended him to be, a constitutional executive. Over against him, a constitutional check upon his actions, is the Standing Committee of the diocese, consisting usually of four presbyters and four laymen elected by the Convention. This Committee is apparently an American novelty. During a vacancy in the episcopal office it is the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese. When there is a bishop his most important official acts must have the consent of the Committee. A young man presenting himself as a candidate for the ministry cannot, no matter how admirable his record, be received as such by the bishop until the Standing Committee has recommended him; nor can the bishop ordain to the diaconate or the priesthood without the same kind of recommendation. Such action is rarely perfunctory and Standing Committees do not hesitate to deny the recommendation if convinced that the bishop is mistaken. In fixing parish boundaries, in consenting to the alienation of consecrated buildings, in instituting inquiry in certain cases of misdemeanour on the part of a clergyman, in others giving consent to the presentment of a clergyman for trial, and in many matters which vary in accordance with diocesan law, the Standing Committee exercises its important functions as representing the clergy and laity. It is, as I have said, a check upon the bishop's power. As such he is not a member of it. But it is also the bishop's Council of Advice and may be called together by him to consider any matters which he deems of sufficient importance. The use made of such a council must depend upon the bishop's own characteristics and upon diocesan tradition. But in general here would fall serious cases of parish trouble, rumours concerning the character of a clergyman, questions concerning religious orders and the like. But the Standing Committee is not in practice, nor in theory is it intended to be, an executive body. It in no way fills the place of what has come into existence during the last decade in most of our dioceses, the Diocesan or Executive Council. That is a body instituted only by diocesan canons and designed to help administer the missionary, educational and other kinds of work undertaken by the diocese. It is the arm of the bishop. Its various departments technically represent him in heading up the work. These Councils, modelled upon the National Council established in 1919, act with the bishop in defining policies for the practical activities of the diocese and in administering the funds raised to support them in the parishes and missions. They have almost everywhere superseded the old familiar boards and committees which worked with very little co-ordination, overlapping on the one hand and on the other leaving great fields untouched. They increase the bishop's contact with the activities of the diocese and assist his understanding of its needs. At the same time they check, like a board of directors, any tendency to arbitrary action on his part. It should be noted also that the Examining Chaplains of a diocese are elected by Convention, although upon nomination by the bishop, and that their independent approval must be given before ordination of a candidate.

Less clearly marked canonically are the bishop's rights as chief pastor in relation to the parishes of the diocese. He must in accordance with the ancient English tradition visit every church in his diocese at least once in three years. This visit is official and includes the duty of inspecting records, inquiring about the condition of the church and conducting such services as he may deem expedient. Some seventy-five years ago in Maryland, his right having been questioned to celebrate the Holy Communion during his visitation, the canon on visitations was amended to confer such right explicitly, although the civil courts had already in the Maryland case decided that it was inherent in his office. It seems strange to-day that any doubt of the bishop's right in the matter could have been entertained ; but the fact that it was illustrates the dread of arbitrary power which so long existed in America, not only in the Church but in the State. The bishop as chief pastor on his visitation has, of course, equally the authority to conduct whatever service he holds in such manner as he thinks fit. He may conform to the use of the parish. Probably in most cases he does. But in principle it is his service in his own church and the ordering of ceremonial is in his hands. At no service at which he is officially present in his own diocese does he lose such right.

But the situation is by no means so clear in the matter of prohibiting practices which meet with his disapproval or of giving positive directions for use through the diocese. In neither case can the bishop's action rest upon any arbitrary decision. He must base it upon an interpretation of canons and rubrics. He must cite his authority. If his authority is questioned he has only two recourses. He may show his disapproval of a priest's action by refusing to visit his parish or he may take steps to present the priest for trial. No one in these days wants an ecclesiastical trial. Indeed the mind of the Church is so uncertain upon matters of discipline that a trial would at best be a doubtful expedient. The House of Bishops for example in 1922 accepted and approved the report of a committee in which it is affirmed that the reservation of the Sacrament 'as a centre of worship' is contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the Church. But such a declaration has had to depend for its execution upon the moral authority which it possesses. No one has attempted to enforce it by trial.

On the other hand there are many cases in which a bishop has refused to visit a recalcitrant parish. To meet such cases and on the instance of a Boston parish which was suffering from such a refusal, the canon on visitations was amended in 1856 so as to provide a way out. At the end of the canonical limit of three years either the bishop or the parish may ask the Presiding Bishop for a Committee of Conciliation to consist of the five neighbouring bishops, and their decision must be accepted. Ordinarily, however, such difficulties are settled in less formal ways. It should be noted that the bishop's position in such a controversy rests upon an inherent right which is accepted without dispute. The bishop is the interpreter of the law of the Church. He is, as Bishop Hopkins of Vermont nearly a century ago was perhaps the first to emphasise in America, 'the judge in his own diocese,' subject to appeal to General Convention for an interpretation on the part of the whole Church.

In the twilight zone, where customs differ and the interpretation of canons is regarded as uncertain, must unquestionably also be placed the matter of the bishop's relation to vestries in the election of rectors. Everywhere the bishop has the power of appointment to the charge of the missions of his diocese, that is, the congregations which are supported in whole or in part by diocesan funds. No such power exists in filling the rectorship of a self-supporting parish. The call is issued by the vestry as representatives of the congregation. But even at the beginning of our constitutional period it was clear to the mind of the Church that the bishop should have some responsibility in the matter, and with various changes in detail the canons bearing on the subject have always included the provision that the bishop (or ecclesiastical authority) must not only be notified of a proposed call but also be satisfied that the person called is a 'duly qualified minister.' This was based upon the English canon of 1603, and has been held by all our leading canonists, and by the civil courts in two or three instances in which appeal has been made to them, to mean not only duly ordained but qualified in character and attainments. Most bishops, however, act upon the assumption that the canonists go too far, and that 'duly qualified' can be interpreted as including only proper canonical standing and worthy character. There the matter stands to-day, and in most dioceses the local canons do no more than detail procedure on the same assumption that this power of the bishop is not arbitrary, would never be exercised in a veto except in cases of unworthy character, and is, therefore, in effect, purely advisory. A few dioceses have gone further in the grant of power. Thirteen give the bishop the right to nominate and require choice from among his nominees. An equal number give him explicitly the veto. In only one is he given appointment of rectors. In every case except that of a few old chartered parishes of the east, these larger powers are in the newer dioceses.

That does not mean, however, that there is any great likelihood of a more general increase of the bishop's power in this matter. The so-called vestry system is not very satisfactory. There is much talk of plans for its modification either by increasing the bishop's power or by associating with him some representative committee. But neither the laity nor the clergy would be willing even in the interests of efficiency to surrender their freedom. The Church is not a business corporation. The actual situation then, taking it generally throughout the country, is that the bishop's part in the filling of parish rectorships is chiefly advisory. In the smaller dioceses and with small parishes remote from the centres it must ordinarily be effective. It is less so in proportion to the extent of the bishop's responsibilities and the accessibility of information from other sources. But in every case his personal influence, if he cares to exert it, is very great.

To make a call complete the bishop must be notified of its acceptance and register it. In the case of a presbyter coming from another diocese he must receive and accept a 'Letter Dimissory,' but in neither case is any institution or induction necessary. The Prayer Book provides such a service. The frequency of its use varies in different parts of the country; but it is not compulsory and the vast majority of rectorships are entered upon without it.

We have already noted that the question of the bishop's authority in directing the order or character of the services in a parish belongs in this same twilight zone. A hundred years ago Bishop White tried to stop 'prayer meetings' in his diocese. A good many bishops tried their hands at stopping certain ritual practices fifty years ago, but with indifferent success. In later years some have tried to stop the reservation of the Sacrament and succeeded. Others have tried and failed. But two things are clear in America as they would be elsewhere in the Anglican Communion. The bishop in the exercise of his liturgical rights may issue services for special occasions or prayers for special objects; but he cannot in any way 'take liberties' with the Book of Common Prayer. On the other hand his liturgical independence, except as General Convention may limit it, is fully recognised in the House of Bishops. If an Office is set forth by that House or a Book of Offices as was done some years ago, its authorisation for use in any diocese rests entirely with the bishop himself. The action of the House carries with it no canonical authority.

All that has been said indicates clearly that the vow of obedience upon the part of the clergy is interpreted in America quite frankly not in a feudal but in a democratic sense. Obedience is to the bishop as representative of the order of the Church, as the executive and interpreter of its law. Indeed this is made clear by the constitutional provision that prior to his ordination every person to be ordained must make in the presence of the bishop a declaration of his acceptance of the Scriptures and promise conformity to ‘ the doctrine, discipline and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church.’ A bishop may have voluntarily given him an almost ‘ feudal ’ obedience ; but the Church gives him no such position. Nor does the case differ in his relations to the laity. In the troubled situation concerning marriage and divorce which exists in America to-day is furnished almost the only field in which the bishop exercises any disciplinary powers in reference to the laity. The canons permit under certain carefully defined conditions the marriage of the innocent party in a divorce for adultery. The case must, however, be submitted to the bishop who must on his part secure legal advice before he renders a decision. To him also must be referred all questions of admitting to the sacraments persons married otherwise than as the Church allows. The high divorce rate and the number of persons involved in one way or another in marriages which are contrary to the law of the Church bring an unceasing flow of such questions, while on the other hand the secularisation of life has reduced to a minimum questions arising under the rubrics of the Communion office or the canon which permits appeal to the bishop by a layman against the decision of his priest. People don’t wait to be refused the Holy Communion. They simply stay away. There are no ‘ social ’ penalties to be feared.

Before passing on to some of the wider relations of the bishop's office a word is in order at this point about cathedrals. As already indicated, the churches in which in earlier days bishops served as rectors were not cathedrals, nor were they so regarded. It was such a church, however, that was the first to have the name cathedral applied to it. In 1862, Bishop Kip of California assumed the rectorship of Grace Church in San Francisco, and thereupon constituted the church his cathedral. But the parish did not cease to be a parish, and with the close of his rectorship its cathedral status was ended until after the great earthquake and fire of 1906, when his successor, Bishop Nichols, merged the parish organisation into that of the present cathedral. At the time of Bishop Kip's action the cathedral 'idea' was coming to expression elsewhere, and soon in Chicago and many other centres of the Middle West cathedral churches began to appear. The movement received great impetus with the establishment of cathedrals in Albany, in Garden City, Long Island, and in New York. With the founding of the great cathedral in Washington in 1898, the 'system' as a permanent part of Church life in America was secured.

Some of these cathedrals are only parishes still controlled by vestries in which the Bishop's Chair is placed and certain rights given him. Others have a quasi-cathedral organisation, with a Chapter as the governing body, but because of the lack of endowments and the appalling practical needs function for the most part as parishes. A few are without parochial responsibilities or are rapidly being rid of them. But steadily there is growing in America the conception of the cathedral as the bishop's church, diocesan in organisation and ministering not to any parochial group but to diocese and community, with the bishop in very close association with all its activities. Such a conception carries with it at least two problems which are as yet far from a solution : the relation of bishop and dean so that the dean's office may have its traditional distinction and independence and yet the church be in a real sense the bishop's church ; and the relation of cathedral and diocese so that the cathedral may be the real centre of diocesan life. In connection with them the bishop's special problem is somewhat paradoxical. He must see to it that the cathedral is at once his church and not his church.

Extra-Diocesan Relations. The bishop is in constant and close relation with his fellow bishops throughout the country. Their approval of his election is necessary to his consecration. Informally his conduct of his office is subject to their scrutiny and in the rare and unhappy event of any proved unworthiness on his part it is by a court of his peers that he is judged. It will be recalled that before Bishops White and Provoost were consecrated the English bishops had objected to leaving the matter of the trial of a clergyman in the hands of a body which included laymen. This was especially obnoxious in the case of a bishop. Changes were made to meet the objection and little by little the present canonical procedure was worked out. Presentment for trial must come from at least three bishops if the charge concerns doctrine. If it concerns morals, presbyters and laymen together may bring the matter before the Presiding Bishop. The Trial Court is composed of nine bishops. The case may be appealed to a Court of Review of the same number, and if the accused is found guilty in a matter of doctrine the decision of the Court must be sustained by a two-thirds majority of the House of Bishops. Fortunately the complicated machinery necessary to this procedure has had to be put into operation only three times, and only once has the trial been for heresy.

Just as the bishop is accorded protection in the way outlined above from the possibilities of factional or personal attack in his own diocese, so the diocese is accorded protection from any irresponsible neglect on the part of its bishop. He must be in residence; he must, as we have seen, make his visitations and attend to his other duties; and if he desires to resign his office he can do so only with the consent of the House of Bishops. At one time, indeed, the Church was so determined that the marriage of the bishop and his diocese should be permanent that it established procedure complicated enough to make resignation almost impossible. The matter rests at present in the House of Bishops, and, recognising the strain which modern conditions bring upon even the strongest, few obstacles are now put in the way of a bishop resigning when age or physical infirmity makes even light responsibilities heavy.

But although a diocesan bishop may resign for reasonable cause, the face of the Church has been rigidly set against his translation to another diocese. No doubt the natural conservatism of ecclesiastical bodies is partly responsible for this. In the early days in America the differences in strength among the few dioceses were so slight as to raise no question of prestige or importance. There was no point in moving a bishop from one to another. No constitutional provision was therefore made for translation, and the Church settled down to the acceptance of the view which still prevails that it would be undesirable. Two grounds are commonly urged. It is said that it would bring a restlessness among the bishops such as is all too common among the clergy. It is said with more obvious accuracy that in the unsettled and migratory life of present-day America it is of great value to the Church to have in the bishop of a diocese one stable and therefore stabilising factor. A missionary bishop may be elected to a diocese after five years in the mission field, and a suffragan at any time ; but as yet reasons like the above have operated to prevent any diocese from attempting to elect the bishop of another, and there is no indication of any likelihood of change of sentiment.

It has been sufficiently clear by implication that in the Church in America there is no archbishop, nor any see which outranks any other. While the vow of obedience taken by priest or deacon still suggests the feudal background, the bishop's vow of obedience is altogether impersonal. 'The Archbishop and the Metropolitical Church' give place to the 'Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.' The Presiding Bishop is not an archbishop. He is in charge automatically of vacant missionary districts, and through his presidency of the National Council which appropriates money for their support is in close touch with their bishops ; but even in their case his responsibility is not archiepiscopal.

That does not mean that the Presiding Bishop is without great responsibilities and an increasingly important place in the Church. At the beginning Presiding Bishop meant the bishop who presided at the meetings of the House of Bishops. This duty after a few years was always given by the House of Bishops to the senior bishop in order of consecration. Upon him naturally devolved the performing of certain necessary official acts on behalf of the House of Bishops or of the Church. These routine responsibilities increased with the growth of the Church. Other responsibilities involving decisions and action were added, until before the close of the last century the Church was fully aware of the fact that these duties added to his necessary diocesan work were more than should be piled upon the shoulders of one who was almost inevitably far beyond the age at which most men retire from active work. Bishop Williams of Connecticut, when Presiding Bishop, and his successor, Bishop Clarke of Rhode Island, had both urged a change. It took a long time to put into shape the necessary provisions. Not until 1919 was agreement reached in legislation providing for the election of a 'Presiding Bishop of the Church' for a term of six years. This decision was certainly pressed upon the Church by the formation that year of the National Council, a representative body into which were absorbed the functions up to that time exercised by the Board of Missions, the Board of Education and other general Church agencies. Consolidation, unifying of policy and economy in work were sought through the new Council. But it had also been clearly the mind of the Church that the executive head of all this general work should be the Presiding Bishop. Obviously the Church could not put upon the senior bishop work so extensive and so heavy. Bishop Clarke was ninety-one when he died, and his successor, Bishop Tuttle, vigorous it seemed as in his early missionary days, was sixty-six when he assumed office and eighty-six when he died.

The legislation of 1919 provided, therefore, that the Presiding Bishop should be the executive head of the Church's activities. He has to think for the Church as a whole. He has to know every part of the immense field into which the money and interest of the Church are thrown, and in addition to all this he has to represent the Church, to speak for the Church on many occasions, to guide policy in relation to other communions and on many public questions. Practically all his time must go into that work. A coadjutor relieves him of the bulk of diocesan administration. It is only four years since the first election of a Presiding Bishop (1925); but already the satisfaction of the Church in the change is apparent.

Consideration of the place of the Presiding Bishop leads to the noting of one somewhat confused situation. Historically regarded the Episcopal Church in America is one Province. It is a Province without an Archbishop or Metropolitical Church, but with a very effective executive for its general work. On the other hand the immense area of the country long ago suggested that there would be great advantage in its division into what would be called provinces from the start and might ultimately grow into real provincial units. For fifty years proposals were constantly before General Convention and here and there experiments were tried along state lines. It was not until 1913 that the beginnings of a provincial system were established. There are now eight provinces. Each has a bishop as President of the Province, who also presides at its Synod meetings; and to these provincial Synods has now been given, among other powers, that of nominating to the House of Bishops a candidate for a vacant missionary district within the Province. It seems likely that ultimately to them will also go the confirmation of diocesan bishops, the election of missionary bishops and the acceptance of episcopal resignations.

The Bishop at Work. It has been remarked at times that anyone looking through the constitution and canons of the Episcopal Church might think that the chief work of the Church is that of putting bishops and presbyters on trial, so long and detailed are the articles dealing with the matter. In some such fashion, looking back over the pages of this essay, one wonders whether they might not give the impression that American bishops spend most of their time performing canonical feats of one kind and another or skilfully avoiding constitutional pitfalls. As a matter of fact most of them forget about canons most of the time; and few, if any, carry the 'Digest' in their bags as they travel. They do travel. It is in American slang one of their 'major sports.' There are two jurisdictions larger in area than Great Britain and Ireland; there are two almost as large. There are two larger than England and Scotland and at least twelve as large as or larger than England. When one comes to dioceses of the size of Wales one has reached the group which would commonly be thought of as small. In many of these vast areas churches are found only here and there, often scores of miles apart.

And so for the majority of American bishops there is constant travel by train or by motor; many nights are spent away from home, and the pastoral work in contacts with the people of the country and the small towns is a part of the daily routine. That is not true as one turns to the larger dioceses and especially to those which centre in the great cities. In them in spite of all a bishop's effort to develop pastoral relations and to exercise leadership in thought and in the deeper ranges of religious life, the dreadful pressure and hurry of American society is perpetually sweeping him into the stream. Committees, luncheons, dinners, speeches here and speeches there, raising money or organising the diocese to raise money—he is fortunate if he is able to keep fresh and warm his pastoral relations with his own clergy and succeed in that most difficult of all his tasks, manning the diocese with men who fit the work they are set to do.

Withal the bishops seem to have succeeded not only in carrying on their own special work with reasonable success and sometimes with brilliant power, but also in helping to bring the Episcopal Church into a position of real distinction and oftentimes of real leadership. It must be remembered that although the Church during the last hundred years has grown from 30,000 communicants to 1,200,000, increasing from 1 in every 400 of the population to 1 in every 90 or thereabouts, it is still a relatively small body. In many parts of the country there are people who know nothing about it. To them a bishop is a mere name. Nowhere has he any civic backing nor any state position.

His salary is ordinarily not large; he lives in a simple house, often a rented one. Yet it is hardly boasting to say that he has given the office distinction. In community movements as well as in religious movements his aid and his leadership are sought. In many places through his personal influence, far more than through his position, and of course quite unofficially, he has become something of that centre of unity which since Ignatius' days has never been lost from the ideal of its episcopate.

Indeed one may say that generally throughout the country no other single group of men has either so great an opportunity or so great a responsibility for reunion as the bishops of the Episcopal Church. They have the confidence of the Protestant world; the representatives of Eastern Christianity, now so numerous in America, turn to them to link them to the life of their adopted country. They bring together Catholic tradition and modern democracy. Their cathedrals offer hospitality to the widest range of community interests. No other body of men represents quite so comprehensive and varied religious contacts and for no other, outside the Roman Communion, is history so insistent upon the ideal of unity. In other words the bishops represent in their several communities in America the strategic values for which the Anglican Communion stands throughout the world.

Such is the position of the bishop in America to-day. What considerable changes another fifty years may bring cannot be forecast. As has been hinted above, there are in America two distinct movements in the Church as in the State which are always in conflict with one another. On the one hand is the unceasing pressure upon the Church of the industrial ideals of efficiency and centralisation. Many people see with equanimity the increase of the bishop's power. They want a strong executive. They see no reason why parishes should not be directed from the diocesan office and dioceses from that of the Presiding Bishop. This very modern motive falls in with that earlier tradition which is sometimes called Catholic, but is really set about with feudal trappings, the tradition of the bishop as ruler, as prelate. The two work together steadily to magnify the bishop's office and extend his power. Quite unconsciously the growing sense of responsibility upon the part of the bishops works in the same direction.

On the other hand we have the traditions of American life and the democratic ideals upon which the early framework of the bishop's office in this country was built—a constitutional executive, surrounded by checks upon the exercise of arbitrary power, leader of a free presbyterate, head of a family rather than of a business machine. To cherish the values in both these movements, to find efficiency without losing freedom, to develop freedom without creating disorder is one of the pressing tasks of the Church in America to-day.

IV

(vi) THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION: CANADA

By J. C. Roper, Bishop of Ottawa

The Church of England in Canada consists of four ecclesiastical provinces, Canada, Ontario, Rupertsland, and British Columbia, each with its own Provincial Synod presided over by its own archbishop, with all the dioceses included in them further organised into a General Synod, over which the Primate of all Canada presides.

To realise the significance of this statement and the problems the Church of England in Canada has had to meet, and the vast area over which the organisation extends, it will be necessary to recall some essential facts of our history and of the beginnings of the Church in our land.

I. Our present ecclesiastical provinces may be associated with the main gateways, all of them great waterways, through which British settlement, and with it the Church of England, entered Canada.

Eastern Canada and the Maritime Provinces. The first two provinces may be called the Provinces of the Atlantic and the St. Lawrence River. Though they now contain two centres, they were once ecclesiastically one. The Province of Canada, established in 1861, joined soon after by Nova Scotia and Fredericton, formed one province under the Metropolitan of Canada until 1912, when the six dioceses in the civil Province of Ontario were made an ecclesiastical province by themselves. These dioceses are: Toronto, 1839; Huron, 1857; Ontario, 1862; Algoma, 1873; Niagara, 1875; and Ottawa, 1896.

The four eastern dioceses, Nova Scotia, 1787; Quebec, 1793; Fredericton, 1845; and Montreal, 1850, remain in the original province and retain the name of the Province of Canada.

From the earliest days the story of the Dominion of Canada has been interwoven with the story of the British Empire. By the Treaty of Utrecht at the close of the War of the Spanish Succession in 1713, Nova Scotia was finally ceded to the British Crown. By the same treaty the Hudson Bay territory was declared to be British. The victories of the Duke of Marlborough in Flanders laid the foundation of a new empire for Great Britain in North America. The Treaty of Paris in 1763 marking the close of the Seven Years' War, and following General Wolfe's victory at Quebec, established British power in Canada. It was, however, the War of Independence of the American Colonies, 1776–83, that really led to the beginning of the Church of England in this country. Up to that time Canada had been almost wholly French. Some British settlements there were in Nova Scotia, and Church of England people had been ministered to by the military and S.P.G. chaplains under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London. In the closing years of the war, and particularly after the Treaty of Versailles in 1783, there came to Canada a great company of people who could not conscientiously surrender allegiance to the British Crown or accept another flag. They were known as United Empire Loyalists, and were officially granted the right to use this title. They numbered some 40,000 in all. Very many of them were members of the Church of England, and were accompanied by the S.P.G. chaplains who had ministered to them in the homes that they were leaving. Their coming greatly increased the British population in Nova Scotia and Quebec and created the new provinces of New Brunswick and Ontario. It must be remembered that the provinces now known as Quebec and Ontario were originally Lower and Upper Canada. It was only after Confederation, 1867, that the title Canada was extended to the whole Dominion.

The close of the Napoleonic wars, and especially of the American War, 1812–14, led to the establishment of many military settlements in these provinces, formed of officers and men of regiments that had fought in Europe and

America and were then disbanded. No other single event, however, has had so great an influence upon the British character of Canadian institutions and upon the history of the Church of England, as the coming of the United Empire Loyalists. Their coming was to eastern Canada what the coming of the Pilgrim Fathers was to the New England States.

Rupertsland and the West. The story of the Province of Rupertsland has a different setting. The gateway was through the Hudson Strait and Hudson Bay. The name which we ecclesiastically still retain recalls the grant made by Charles II to his cousin Prince Rupert in 1670. The charter gave to the Prince and his ‘ Company of Adventurers of England trading in Hudson Bay,’ all the territory watered by the rivers which flow into the Bay. This meant the territory east of the Bay extending to Labrador and on the west along the great River Saskatchewan, which in its northern and southern branches extends to the foothills of the Rocky Mountains. Ultimately the territory was extended northwards to the Arctic Ocean and beyond the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Coast.

It is interesting to see in an old map the name of Rupertsland on the east as well as on the west of Hudson Bay. This was in accordance with the charter. It was also the origin of the vast area covered by our present ecclesiastical province and the inclusion within it of the great missionary Dioceses of Moosonee 1872, and Keewatin 1902, on the east and west sides of Hudson Bay, Mackenzie River in 1884, and the Yukon in 1891, all four of which extend to the Arctic Ocean ; and together with them the Mother Diocese of Rupertsland (Manitoba) 1849, Brandon 1924, Saskatchewan 1874, Qu’Appelle 1884, Calgary 1888, Edmonton 1914, and Athabasca 1873.

The story of Rupertsland and of the West would need three chapters at least for its telling, of which I can only indicate the titles.

The quest of the North-West Passage which led to the exploration of the Atlantic Coast and Eastern Arctic, Frobisher Bay, Davis Strait, Baffinland and Hudson Strait and Bay, all record the names of the early heroes of this quest.

The story of the fur trade: of the Hudson Bay Company and of its early rival the North-West Company of Montreal, which was amalgamated with the Hudson Bay Company in 1821. It was in the pursuit of the fur trade that the great pioneers of the North-West Company, Alexander McKenzie, Simon Fraser, and David Thompson, explored the great rivers which bear their names, from their rising in the Rocky Mountains to their outlets in the Arctic and Pacific Oceans.

And the story of the settlement of a permanent population beginning with Lord Selkirk's colonists from Scotland in 1811, gradually extending over the prairies, and now advancing rapidly, as the wheat-growing area advances northwards.

To these three we must add a fourth, the story of the founding and extension of the Church.

In the year 1920 a large company of Church people, under Archbishop Matheson, our Primate, made a pilgrimage to the churches now representing the first churches built on the banks of the Red River—St. John's, St. Paul's, St. Andrew's and St. Peter's. It was the commemoration of the hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Rev. John West, 1820, the first English missionary to the Red River settlement. As we stood that day at the grave of Archdeacon William Cochran at St. Andrew's, and of Archbishop Machray at St. John's, the Cathedral of the Diocese of Rupertsland, we were moved to deep thanksgiving to God for the wonderful work of evangelisation and organisation that had been accomplished from these centres.

John West came out as a C.M.S. missionary and chaplain of the Hudson Bay Company. From his time onwards a constant succession of missionaries and pioneers for Christ have gone out from these churches on the riverside, and from the C.M.S. in England, and have penetrated to the farthest point of the vast territory of Rupertsland.

From the first the relations of the Church and Hudson Bay Company have been very close and of great mutual helpfulness. The highways of the missionaries have been the great rivers and their tributaries, and their resting-places and ultimate centres of work have been the factories, forts and posts of the Hudson Bay Company. From the officers of the Company the Church has received many acts of kindness and many generous gifts.

On the other hand, all who have had dealings with the Indian and Eskimo owe very much to the work of our missionaries, who have travelled to find these scattered tribes, have lived with them, have established schools for them, have reduced their many languages to writing, have translated the Bible and Prayer Book for them, and have won them for Christ.

The work of the Church for more than a hundred years has not been the least among the influences which have made it possible for white traders and settlers in Canada to live with the Indian and Eskimo peoples in almost unbroken peace. It was in the year 1920 also that the C.M.S., after maintaining its splendid evangelistic and educational work for a hundred years, handed over its responsibilities for the Indians and Eskimo to the Missionary Society of the Canadian Church.

In the organisation of the Church in the West, Archbishop Machray was the Master Builder. The life of a great bishop is recorded in his words, ‘ By the providence of God I have been present at the birth of a new people.’

British Columbia and the Pacific Coast. The third gateway to Canada has been from the Pacific Ocean, and the story of exploration and settlement of British Columbia is similar in many ways to those we have already been recalling, but it has features of its own. We do not usually associate Captain Cook with Canada, and yet he should have a prominent place among the founders of our nation. It was by his skill in charting the St. Lawrence from the ocean to Quebec that the naval expedition under Admiral Saunders was able to bring Wolfe’s army up the river without the grounding of a single ship.

In 1745 the British Parliament offered a reward of £20,000 for the discovery of a sea passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific. In 1775 the scope of the award was extended to any British seaman who should find and sail through any passage by sea between the Atlantic and the Pacific from east to west, or west to east, northward of the 52nd parallel. Captain Cook had just returned, in 1776, from his second voyage round the world, and was accepted to lead a scientific expedition, well equipped by the Admiralty, to settle the question of a rumoured strait extending from the North Pacific to Hudson Bay. There had been other explorers, both Russian from the north and Spanish from the south, but Captain Cook was the first British seaman to penetrate those waters since Francis Drake sailed there in the *Golden Hind.* The expedition did not discover the mythical 'Strait of Arrian,' but it did produce two important results, the establishment of the Pacific fur trade and the ultimate possession of British Columbia by Great Britain.

Captain Cook landed for a time at Friendly Cove, Nootka, an island off the west coast of Vancouver Island. His crews purchased sea-otter furs from the natives, and sold them later at Canton. This was the beginning of the Pacific fur trade, of which Nootka became the earliest centre. Many British ships were soon employed. Some of these in 1789 were seized by the Spanish naval commanders. For Spain, since the day when Balboa first saw the Pacific, claimed as her own the ocean 'from pole arctic to pole antarctic,' and the shores it washed. The two nations were on the verge of war. A British fleet called the 'Spanish Armament' was assembled in 1790 at Spithead, but Spain yielded her exclusive claims. In October 1790 the Nootka Convention was signed, which guaranteed to each nation the right of navigation and fishing in the Pacific, and the right also of landing for trade and for settlement in places unoccupied by the other. Under this Convention, by right of trade and settlement, British Columbia came to be a possession of the British Crown.

The beginning of the Church in this province also was closely connected with the Hudson Bay Company. In anticipation of the Treaty of Oregon in 1846, which determined the frontier between British Columbia and the United States to be the 49th parallel, the Hudson Bay Company moved (1842) its headquarters from the old Fort Vancouver on the Columbia River, south of the line, to 'Camosun,' renamed Fort Victoria, on Vancouver Island.

Victoria became at once the centre of the trade and influence of the Hudson Bay Company on the Pacific Coast. The land on which the cathedral and bishop's residence stand was part of a grant by the Hudson Bay Company for Church purposes. The first Anglican clergymen came to Victoria as Hudson Bay Company chaplains.

It was from Victoria that our Church work spread over the province. It is different in character from that of the north-west. The wealth of British Columbia is in forests, mines and fisheries, and the Church has followed her people not only in cities and settlements, but into camps of every kind, wherever they are found. Population in large numbers began with a great rush of gold seekers in 1858, which spread along the banks of the Fraser River and tributaries; later to the Cariboo country and the Great Bend of the Columbia; later still and more recently to the Yukon and the north.

The bishopric was founded in 1859. Bishop Hills, the first and pioneer bishop, as Bishop of British Columbia had charge of the whole area now included in the civil province. In 1879 two new dioceses were formed, Caledonia and New Westminster. The latter has subsequently been divided by the creation of the Dioceses of Kootenay, 1915, and Cariboo, 1925.

Notable work has been done among the Indians of the province, especially along the northern rivers of the mainland, and among the Haidas, in the Queen Charlotte Islands, and also among Orientals, Chinese and Japanese, who are found in large numbers in British Columbia.

II. The Development of Organisation. This brief review will show that the Church in Canada has already a long history behind it, and that the dioceses have multiplied gradually until they now cover a vast territory from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific, and from the United States frontier to the Arctic Ocean. For the study of our Church government and organisation in fuller detail we must turn first to eastern Canada.

Early Days in Canada. In the eighteenth century, when our story began, the only ideal of a colonial Church, both at home and in the colonies themselves, was that of a

Church established and endowed by the State, controlled from the Colonial Office through instructions issued from time to time to the local Governors, and bound by the strongest legal ties to the Church in the old land.

In Canada this ideal was first clearly expressed in an Imperial Act—The Canada Constitutional Act—passed in 1791. Its main purpose was the granting of self-government to the two provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, but it had also important ecclesiastical clauses and was intended to be the charter of the Church as well as of the provinces. Into these ecclesiastical clauses had been gathered up the whole policy regarding the Church which had been evolving from precedent to precedent at the Colonial Office for nearly two centuries, and can be traced to its origin in the policy of Archbishop Laud for Englishmen who had left the shores of England.

The Act provided for the establishment and endowment of the Church of England in Canada, but left the necessary action to be taken by the newly established Provincial Legislatures. In accordance with this general policy the Church had been previously established in Nova Scotia in 1758 by the local legislature of that province. The establishment included the allotment of glebes, together with the payment of the incumbents by the Government. In the two Canadas the provisions of the Act were never fully carried out. The Church was not established. It was, however, endowed by the provision that whenever grants of land should be made, one-seventh of the land so granted should be reserved for the support of the clergy. The inherited outlook and expectations of the Church of England people must be remembered, and the goodwill of the Government and its intention to be generous must be recognised in these early provisions. There was, however, inherent weakness in the ideal, and its inadequacy to colonial conditions brought about an inevitable breakdown.

Both from without and within the situation became gradually impossible. Other religious bodies were growing rapidly in numbers, and the special provisions granted by establishment and endowment to the Church of England aroused strong resentment and led to long and unhappy controversies.

In 1854 the Canadian Legislature passed an Act which secularised the clergy reserves, with the expressed intention of severing 'all semblance of connection between the Church and State in Canada.'

Within the Church itself from the earliest beginning to the meeting of the first Diocesan Synod in 1853, bishops, clergy and people alike were beset by perplexities and questionings. Happily the spiritual work of the Church, though hindered by lack of organisation, was not dependent on it. Devoted lives all the while were providing as best they could for the spiritual needs of the people, and for the extension of the Church.

The difficulties, however, were very great. It was a time of 'synodless bishops and unorganised clergy.' The bishops were isolated from one another, and had no sufficient opportunity of taking counsel with clergy and laity. They depended for their jurisdiction upon Letters Patent from the Crown. Both they and the clergy over whom they ruled were uncertain as to the ecclesiastical law which should guide their decisions.

The principle of self-support, difficult enough in the early days of the colony, was not developed. The S.P.G. is spoken of again and again with deepest gratitude. Without its generous and constant support through the whole period the Church could not have been sustained. It was clear, however, that the Government contributions were becoming more and more precarious, and even the S.P.G. could not continue its gifts indefinitely. Some new provision must be made for the government and discipline of the Church, and for its extension and support. Men's minds turned towards the inherent right of the Church to govern herself under her Divine Head, and towards the revival of Synods.

Preparation for Synods. In the establishment of her Synods the Church in Canada possessed two wise and patient leaders. Our greatest debt we owe to John Strachan, first Bishop of Toronto, learned, rugged and strong, a born leader of men, who came to Canada from Aberdeen, and second only to him was the third Bishop of Quebec, Bishop

George J. Mountain, a man of saintly character, wide missionary vision, and untiring zeal. His journey in 1844 by canoe from Montreal to the Red River settlement was one of the great missionary achievements of our early days. It was the first visit of a bishop to our Church of England people in the west, and its influence in deepening among them the apprehension of the true nature of the Church and her sacraments and worship has never been forgotten.

Bishop George Mountain took a leading part in the establishment of the Bishoprics of Montreal and Rupertsland, and entered into the correspondence which led to the establishment of the Bishopric of British Columbia.

In the preliminary steps towards the establishment of Synods, and especially in the discussions of principles and duties of their constitution, the Church in Canada had much in common with similar movements elsewhere. The revival, however, began in Canada at a very early date. This was due chiefly to the urgency of the need, but particularly also to the experience of organised self-government in the Church of the United States. Bishop Strachan, who was in personal touch for many years with Bishop White of Pennsylvania, began to plan for Diocesan Synods as early as 1832. Four years later, his friend, T. B. Fuller, afterwards first Bishop of Niagara, published a pamphlet on 'The Present State and Future Prospects of the Church in Canada,' in which he gives a graphic picture of the troubles and anxieties of the times, and urged that the only remedy would be found in a Synod formed on the model of the Diocesan Conventions in the United States.

In 1839, Bishop Strachan, when in England for his consecration, made a careful inquiry as to principles of synodical action. Two years later, in a charge at his primary visitation of the clergy of Toronto, he urged delay on the ground of advice received at home to the effect that there was great uncertainty as to what exactly the constitution of a Synod should be, and that Synods would not bring benefits that could not be obtained by visitations of the clergy such as were already held.

In the years that followed, Canadian bishops were in touch with what was happening in other parts of the Church.

The movement for the revival of Convocation in England, the Synods of Bishop and Clergy called by Bishop Selwyn in New Zealand, and the movement in Australia under the Bishops of Sydney and Melbourne were well known to them.

Two Important Conferences. Two important conferences prepared the way for the actual formation of the first Synod in Canada. In May 1851, Bishop Strachan, on the occasion of his fourth visitation of the clergy of the diocese, called for the first time a Diocesan Conference consisting of the bishop and clergy and lay representatives elected by the parishes. It was a conference and not a Synod, but was a step necessary to bring about the formation of a Synod. Its chief action was the passing of a resolution that a Diocesan Synod should be duly formed.

In September 1851 the movement inaugurated by Bishop Strachan passed into a wider sphere. At the invitation of Bishop Mountain, the bishops of British North America met for the first time in conference at Quebec. It was a notable gathering. Five bishops were present, as strong a group of men individually and collectively as the Church has ever had in Canada—George J. Mountain of Quebec, John Strachan of Toronto, Edward Feild of Newfoundland, John Medley of Fredericton, and Francis Fulford of Montreal. Two bishops were absent, the Bishop of Nova Scotia, Herbert Binney, who had but just arrived in the diocese, and David Anderson of Rupertsland, who was too far away for communication to reach him in time.

The meeting was a matter of universal interest in Canada. Decisions were reached on many details of administration which in this country had never before been considered by bishops sitting together in council. Its main purpose, however, was to prepare and present to the Archbishop of Canterbury a plan on which both Diocesan Synods and a Provincial Synod could be formed, and to plead for his approval of it ; and further to ask for his aid in the removal of legal disabilities which were thought to hinder the formation of the Synods proposed, and especially in procuring the sanction of the Crown for the appointment of a Metropolitan for Canada.

The minutes of the conference are full of interest. The opening sentences show that the bishops were moved by a high sense of pastoral responsibility. At the close they express 'unfeigned thankfulness to Almighty God that He has preserved to us in this branch of Christ's Holy Church, the assurance of an Apostolic Commission for our calling, and together with it a confession of pure Catholic truth and the fullness of sacramental grace.'

The mind of the conference upon the special matter under discussion appears also in the correspondence which followed. The Archbishop of Canterbury in his answer said that, as matters stood in England, very great difficulty would be found in the way of attaining synodical action, but that the appointment of a Metropolitan would be more readily practicable. To this the Bishop of Quebec replied that apart from the object of his presiding in the councils of this branch of the colonial Church, there would be no advantage in pressing upon Her Majesty's Government the appointment of a Metropolitan at all, and that until such an appointment could be obtained the bishops would prefer to remain as they were under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Ideals and Principles. At this point it will make the situation clearer if we try to state briefly what the ideals were which our bishops were maintaining, and the principles on which they were determined that Synods should be based. These are easily gathered from the documents at hand.

First of all it must be remembered that it was no theoretical discussion in which they were engaged. They were meeting urgent and pressing needs amid circumstances of great perplexity. They had reached a clear conviction that the revival of Synods was necessary for the well-being of the Church. The personal autocracy with which the Letters Patent clothed the bishop in each diocese they felt to be not in accordance with episcopal government in the primitive Church. The ideal expressed by Bishop Strachan was 'the Church assembled in all her fullness, the Bishop in the midst of his people and clergy under legal authority to manage her own affairs, and provide for her discipline and extension.'

At the same time they contended that the bishop's authority was not to be lost in the assembly. Episcopal government was of Divine institution, though it must be exercised constitutionally. The bishop in Synod was present not simply as chairman but as a member of a distinct order. This point was emphatically made from the first both by Bishop Strachan and Bishop Mountain. The gradual appreciation of it removed a difficulty felt in some quarters concerning what has been sometimes known as the Bishop's veto.

Again the great appeal was to the primitive Church, and our bishops at that time were every one of them well qualified to make it, and yet under the special circumstances and history of the Church of England they were in grave doubt as to where due authority was to be found by which the revival of Synods could be legitimately sanctioned. The bishops, and the great majority of the clergy with them, believed that they were bound in conscience by the Acts of Henry VIII and Elizabeth, by which they held that Churchmen in the colonies were restrained from assembling in Synod and passing canons without the royal license. They knew well that a large measure of self-government in the colonial Church was long overdue, but they shrank from any step that would imperil the position of the Church in Canada as an integral part of the Church of England at home and throughout the world. For this reason, as well as in personal loyalty to the Crown, they decided that the royal supremacy should be maintained.

The principles on which Synods should be formed were clearly defined by the Quebec Conference. They are as follows:

1. That the bishop, clergy and laity of the Church in each diocese should meet together in the Synod at such times and in such manner as may be agreed upon.

2. That the laity in such Synod should meet by representation and that their representatives should be communicants.

3. That as questions would arise from time to time, which would affect the welfare of the Church in these colonies, it is desirable that the bishop, clergy and laity should meet in council under a Provincial Metropolitan,

with power to frame such rules and regulations for the better conduct of our ecclesiastical affairs as by the said Council shall be deemed expedient.

4. That the said Council should be divided into two Houses, the one consisting of bishops of the several dioceses under the Metropolitan, and the other of the presbyters and lay members of the Church assembled as before mentioned by representation.

It was further unanimously agreed that these Synods, including the Provincial Synod, should be limited in their action to matters concerning the maintenance, discipline and extension of the Church, and that the standards of doctrine and worship should remain unaltered.

III. The Making of Synods. What has already been said will make it possible to speak briefly of the actual making of our Synods.

The First Diocesan Synod in Canada: Toronto, October 1853. The Toronto Conference of 1851 had approved of the formation of a Diocesan Synod, but had taken no decisive action. The bishops in Quebec in the same year had formed a definite plan for Diocesan Synods and a Provincial Synod, and had referred the matter to the authorities of the Church and State in England. The bishops in Australia had taken similar action a year earlier, in 1850. Important matters of administration were dealt with more fully in Australia, details of the constitution of Synods more fully in Canada. In 1852 Bishop Broughton of Sydney sent an appeal to our bishops through Bishop Mountain of Quebec to join in a conference in London for the purpose of procuring from the Government in England some relief from the restrictions which English statutes were believed to impose upon the inauguration of synodical action in the colonies. Bishop Broughton and Bishop Mountain had been consecrated together in 1836, and now were senior prelates in Australia and British North America, and were fitting persons to represent the wants which had been acknowledged by Councils of Bishops held in both countries. The conference was attended also by the Bishops of Newfoundland, Antigua, Nova Scotia, and Cape Town. The Archbishop of Canterbury and eighteen English diocesans joined in the discussions. It was, in effect, an anticipation of the future Lambeth Conferences. The principles and details of synodical government already agreed upon in Australia and at Quebec were embodied in the 'Colonial Church Regulation Bill.' The Bill was presented in the House of Lords by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and in the House of Commons by Mr. Gladstone. It passed in the House of Lords, but failed to pass in the House of Commons on August 23, 1853.

In October 1853, in Toronto, the Diocesan Conference met again. Clergy and laity were at one with the bishops who had so long and so patiently advocated the cause of Synods. It was a critical moment. It was well known to all that Mr. Gladstone had advised the colonial churches to organise themselves freely on the 'basis of voluntary consensual compact which was the basis on which the Church of Christ rested from the first.' It was known also that Synods of bishops and clergy held in New Zealand by Bishop Selwyn had been pronounced by the law officers in England to be illegal. The Colonial Church Regulation Bill, from which so much had been hoped, had been rejected. Feeling at the conference was tense and expectant, and action could not be delayed.

The first resolution proposed was a protest against the existing informal system of assembling the Church and a solemn and respectful declaration of the right to meet as a Synod 'refusing to admit the right of interference from any quarter.'

Those who know his tradition can almost hear Bishop Strachan's voice warning that such action would be 'forgetting impediments which they could not remove.' He approved, however, of another resolution, 'that this meeting convened by the Lord Bishop and composed firstly of the Lord Bishop of the Diocese, secondly of the clergy of the Diocese, and thirdly of the lay representatives of the several congregations of the Diocese, is the Diocesan Synod of this Diocese, and that we now proceed to the transaction of the business we have commenced.'

The first modern Diocesan Synod in the Church of England was formed. Three notes should be added :

1. This action was possible because it was no longer the isolated action of a single diocese. The framework upon which all our Synods have since been modelled had been agreed upon by the Conference of Bishops in London, and had been incorporated in the rejected Bill. It could be held, therefore, to express the mind of the Church of England upon the organisation of Synods. The place of the Bishop of the Diocese in his Synod and of the House of Bishops in the Provincial Synod was clearly defined; the qualifications of clergy expressed in declarations and subscriptions required before ordination and license were included; the qualifications of lay representatives and of the members of the parish meeting by which they were appointed and the mode of their appointment, were prescribed. The rejection of the Bill by the House of Commons could not stay the Church's action.

2. Further, the course that affairs had taken had secured one object for which Bishop Strachan had consistently pleaded. He emphasises it again in a memorandum sent to the Colonial Secretary in 1853. 'The great object would be to gain the assent of the colonial Church to a constitution settling all cardinal points, and placing them beyond the influence of disturbing forces within the separate dioceses, which might disturb the unity of the Church, and impair its resemblance to the Church of England in England.' This object had been gained, not as the bishop hoped and urged, by Imperial Statute, but by a conference of colonial bishops. A few years later, in 1857, Bishop Mountain in forming his Synod in the Diocese of Quebec, was able to urge, 'we have precedents and patterns already before our eyes, and all uniform in essential characteristics throughout the Empire. We are now following in the wake of sixteen colonial dioceses, being the whole number in which synodical action has taken place.'

3. By the Constitution of the Synod of Toronto a great step in advance had been made. Nevertheless, the consciences of loyal men were not yet at ease. Royal supremacy was still to them a reality and a necessity. Churchmen of that day could not believe that the rejection of the Colonial Church Regulations Bill was final. Another appeal was

made to the authorities at home, this time through the Provincial Legislature of Canada. An address to the Crown was forwarded praying for the passing of an Imperial Statute for the repeal, so far as they affected Canada, of all such statutes as impede the meeting of clergy and laity in Synod for the purpose of framing rules and canons. The law officers of the Crown declared in August 1855 that the action asked for was impeded by the fact that it would affect the Church not in Canada alone, but throughout the colonial possessions of the Empire, and would seriously affect the royal supremacy in the colonies. Eventually what could not be done in England was done by the Canadian Legislature by two short Acts, which received royal assent in 1857 and 1858. This legislation did not confer any right upon the Church. Its purpose was to remove scruples which existed in the minds of the members of the Church and to declare that the Church could meet in Synod to regulate its own affairs, and to appoint and discipline its own officers. The royal supremacy as it had hitherto been exercised in Canada was really at an end. This was not, however, realised at once. It was only gradually that the election of bishops was made with full freedom. In 1857 the first Bishop of Huron was elected by the Synod of Huron, but consecrated at Lambeth, under a mandate of the Queen to the Archbishop of Canterbury. In 1861 the first Bishop of Ontario was elected by the Synod of Ontario, but consecrated in 1862 by a mandate from the Queen to the newly appointed Metropolitan of Canada. This was the first consecration of a bishop in Canada. In 1867 the coadjutor Bishop of Toronto, afterwards second Bishop of Toronto, was consecrated under a mandate from the Metropolitan of Canada alone.

The Church in Canada had anticipated by its actions the decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of 1863 and 1865, by which it was declared that the Church of England in places where there is no Church established by law is in the same situation with any other religious body, in no better but in no worse position, and the members had the same freedom of self-government; and further that the Crown had no power to create territorial dioceses or grant the bishops ecclesiastical jurisdiction in colonies possessing independent legislatures.

The First Provincial Synod in Canada: Montreal, September 1861. In the formation of the first Provincial Synod, the leadership so long exercised by Bishop Strachan and Bishop Mountain passed to Bishop Fulford of Montreal. From the first it has been realised that Diocesan Synods alone would not be adequate, and provision had been made in all the conferences for the meeting of dioceses in a Provincial Synod under a Metropolitan. In 1861, following upon a petition from the Dioceses of Quebec, Toronto and Montreal, the Bishop of Montreal was appointed Metropolitan of Canada by the Queen, and Letters Patent issued. These Letters fixed the Metropolitical See at Montreal, and conferred upon the Metropolitan the power to perform all functions peculiar and appropriate to the office of Metropolitan within the sees constituting the province. His commission included power and authority to visit dioceses in the province once in five years or oftener as occasion required 'for correction and supplying defects, with all manner of visitorial jurisdiction, power and coercion.' During his visits the Metropolitan was empowered to inhibit the diocesan bishop and all his officers, and to exercise himself all ordinary jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese.

It is interesting to note that there was no longer uncritical confidence in the wording of Letters Patent. The Metropolitan found some inaccuracies in them and some things 'not in harmony with our Synod Acts.' He presented these to the Colonial Secretary, and in reply was requested to submit the Letters Patent to other bishops, and to persons in whose legal knowledge he had confidence. Bishop Fulford submitted the document to the Synod of the province just assembled for its first session. In his charge he declared that he asked for no exceptional powers, but only that in the constitution of his office 'the keynote of primitive antiquity should be so sounded that an echo should be awakened throughout the land,' and further, 'that relations with the Mother Church in England, and all its branches extending throughout every quarter of the world, should be preserved in loving and faithful unity.'

The members of both Houses of the Synod were fully aware of their responsibility in determining the constitution of a Provincial Synod and the powers of a Metropolitan. No hasty action was taken. The wording of the Letters Patent was not amended in detail. The Synod was content at the time to add two clauses declaring that the provisions concerning the Metropolitical See and the powers of the Metropolitan, 'should be subject to such rules, regulations and canons as shall or may be made in respect thereof by the bishop, clergy and laity of the said province in their General Assembly.'

Our first Metropolitan's desire has been fulfilled, and the echo of his counsel has been heard in the constitution and canons subsequently and gradually made in the Provincial Synods of Canada.

The General Synod: Toronto, September 1893. Many influences led to the establishment of the General Synod. For the greater part of our history the several divisions of the Church originating from different centres had very little intercourse one with the other. In the west and in British Columbia intimate Church relations were not with Canada but with England. In the east the Church was growing more and more independent and self-governing.

A new stage in our Church life was now developing.

The birth of the Dominion of Canada (1867), in the confederation of the civil provinces under one Dominion Government, awakened a realisation gradually increasing everywhere that Canadians are one nation.

The completion of the Canadian Pacific, the first transcontinental railway, in 1885, and the rapid extension of other railway systems made practicable intercommunication which had before been impossible.

The formation of a 'Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society' by the Provincial Synod of Canada led to a recognition of obligation towards the west. The increase of settlement in the west led to a reasonable expectation of help from the older dioceses in the east, which hitherto had contributed little or no financial help to the west at all.

The first suggestion of a General Synod was made by a group of lay representatives of the Diocese of Huron, who saw the advantage and necessity of a Synod that would have jurisdiction over the Church in the Dominion as a whole. The greatest personal influence in its formation was that of Archbishop Machray of Rupertsland, who became our first Primate. The chief problem lay in the question of the retention or non-retention of Provincial Synods.

In Rupertsland, the Metropolitan in consenting to the formation of new dioceses did not surrender the jurisdiction he had originally as bishop of the whole territory. The dioceses of the Province of Rupertsland were, therefore, never wholly independent, but were always members of the province. Important matters—for example, Clergy Beneficiary Funds—were from the first Provincial and not Diocesan. In the Province of Canada, on the other hand, there had been no such cohesion. The earlier dioceses had had a long period of independent existence before the Provincial Synod was established.

After a preliminary conference in Winnipeg, 1890, the General Synod was formed in Toronto in September 1893. Its basis is representation by dioceses. Its membership does not include any representation of Provincial Synods. Nevertheless, it was accepted as a fundamental principle that 'the constitution of the General Synod involves no change in the existing system of Provincial Synods,' and further that 'no canon of a coercive character or involving penalties or disabilities should be operative without the assent of the Provincial and Diocesan Synods.'

The retention or abolition of Provincial Synods was left to the provinces themselves to decide.

Jurisdiction of the General Synod. The objects which are within the jurisdiction of the General Synod are definitely prescribed. They include :

Matters of Doctrine, Worship and Discipline.
All agencies employed in the carrying on of the general work of the Church.
The general missionary and educational work of the Church.
The adjustment as between dioceses or provinces or Clergy Beneficiary Funds.

Regulations affecting transfer of clergy from one diocese to another.
The education and training of candidates for Holy Orders.
Constitution and powers of an Appellate Tribunal.
The erection, division or rearrangement of provinces.[1]

In accordance with these powers the General Synod has sanctioned the formation of a Provincial Synod for Ontario, 1912, and for British Columbia, 1915. A Missionary Society for the whole Church in Canada has been formed, which has responsibility for all the general missionary work of the Church. The Society has established two missionary dioceses, Honan and Mid-Japan, and has taken charge of the missionary district of Kangra in the Diocese of Lahore. There have also been formed a General Board of Religious Education, and a Council for Social Service, in which all the dioceses are represented. The executive work of the Synod between its triennial sessions is carried on by a representative council which meets annually. The first canon of the Synod constitutes a Supreme Court of Appeal. The Court consists of all the bishops of the Church of England in Canada who have a right to sit in General Synod, together with five assessors, laymen of high legal standing, who are also communicants of the Church. The Supreme Court has power to hear and determine appeals which affect the subjects of doctrine and worship.

IV. **Notes on Details of Organisation.** In the history of the development of our Church organisation important subjects have been omitted, on the ground that they can be more satisfactorily considered in a series of special notes.

Powers of the Laity. In the conduct of ecclesiastical affairs in Canada the laity of the Church have important responsibility. This extends from membership in the parish meeting to membership by representation in the Diocesan, Provincial and General Synods. It includes also a voice in the management of the temporalities of the parish (responsibility for spiritual oversight and the conduct of services are reserved to the incumbent) ; a voice in almost all dioceses in the choice of the parish priest ; and a voice, by representation in the Synod, in the election of the bishop of the diocese.

---

[1] The erection, division, or rearrangement of dioceses and the appointment and consecration of bishops within a province remained under the jurisdiction of Provincial Synods.

The admission of the laity to a place and vote in Diocesan and Provincial Synods arose out of conditions of colonial life, and especially out of the necessity for self-support. Bishop Strachan maintained that those who are called upon to contribute the funds have a claim to a share in the management and expenditure. The principle of their admission was generally accepted before the Synods were formed, and was also endorsed by the conference of English and Colonial Bishops in 1853.

The membership of laymen in the General Synod, which may take action in matters of doctrine and worship, is a greater innovation, and yet in the light of the experience of many years of Synod life no other course was feasible.

'The voice of the laity in one form or another has always been a most essential part of the voice of the whole Church. Even in the most vital case of fundamental doctrine the Church diffusive in which the laity are included has a kind of veto, as I understand it, on the decision of the General Council. . . . Now if they, the laity, have a negative voice, it is not prima facie essential at what stage in the discussion that voice is permitted to be heard.'[1]

Those of us who value Catholic precedent have come to regard the membership of the laity in the General Synod as giving to them in modern times and in a modern method an opportunity of exercising the right of concurrence which has always been their privilege as members of the whole Body of Christ. We believe, therefore, that it is not inconsistent with Catholic principle. In point of fact the lay voice in our Synods has hitherto proved to be a valuable and conservative element. The final decision on matters of doctrine and worship remains with the bishops.

Powers of the Clergy. The powers of the clergy in Canada are in general such as have always belonged to the priesthood in the Church of God, with this addition, that with us they have in Synod a right with the laity to choose their own bishop. The only special notes necessary would seem to be concerning the appointment of parish priests and the permanence of their charge.

---

[1] John Keble, *Letters of Spiritual Counsel*, p. 296.

In the methods by which clergy are appointed to parishes there is no uniformity amongst us. Each diocese has its own procedure, the details of which are prescribed by canon.

The situation as a whole may be described in this way. Everywhere a special responsibility rests with the bishop. This varies in degree in every diocese. In one diocese the tradition has been that the parishes elect their parish priests, while the bishop has a veto for stated reasons on the election. In another diocese all appointments are vested in the bishop personally. The more usual process is that the bishop appoints in consultation with the parish, that is to say, with a committee of concurrence elected for this purpose, or with a permanent Church Committee, which, if a vacancy occurs, is charged with this duty together with its other functions. Sometimes the initiative is with the bishop, sometimes with the parish. In one diocese the Synod appoints a 'Selection Committee' to act in consultation with the parish and with the bishop.

As to the status of a priest in the cure of souls, there may be some difference of opinion. The following statement, however, can be made on good authority. The rights associated with the 'Parson's Freehold' cannot be transferred to a country where there are few or no endowments and the income of the rector is supplied by the contributions of the people. On the other hand the custom of the Church in the Motherland has given rise to a general presumption that a priest who has been instituted or licensed to a cure of souls can claim permanency in his charge. If there are conditions in any diocese which limit this, they must be found in the words or implications of the canons of the Diocesan Synod.

In accordance with this position in some dioceses the distinction is made between self-supporting parishes and missions, appointments to parishes being permanent, while priests in missions can be moved by the bishop's sole decision. Further, several dioceses have canons on discipline which provide for the possible severance of parochial relations in cases where for some sufficient reason a priest's ability to fulfil his parish duties adequately has come to an end. Where this is the case the rights of the priest are protected by provisions carefully laid down in the canon. In one diocese the operation of a canon of this kind is limited by the provision that it shall not apply to any case arising out of or involving a question of ‘ doctrine, practice or ritual.’

A distinction between institution and license is sometimes carefully made. In other dioceses licenses only are issued. In either case the status of the clergyman depends not on the instrument of his appointment alone, but upon the canons of the diocese on which the appointment rests.

Election of Bishops. One general rule prevails. The bishop is elected by the Diocesan Synod, and his election is confirmed by the bishops of the province. Differences are found only in detail. For example, in some dioceses provision is made for the right to delegate the choice ot a bishop to some other authority which the Synod may designate. In some cases nominations are made before the election begins. In others voting is upon the names that appear in the first ballot.

In the province of Rupertsland a distinction is made between the self-supporting dioceses and the missionary dioceses. A diocese is self-supporting if it has six self-supporting parishes. For a missionary diocese the bishop is elected by the Provincial Synod. If a vacancy occurs between sessions the election is made by an electoral committee consisting of the Upper House and representatives of the Lower House appointed at each session of the Synod. The diocese concerned has a double representation. Nomination is by the Upper House; the Lower House accepts or rejects.

The election of the Bishop of Rupertsland, who is also Metropolitan, is more complicated. The electing body consists of the House of Bishops of the province and the delegates of the electoral committee appointed as above. In this case the bishops and delegates sit and vote together. Provision is also made that the Diocese of Rupertsland shall have an adequate but not a dominant representation.

In other provinces there is no fixed Metropolitical see. The Metropolitan is elected by the bishops of the province from among their own number.

Powers of a Metropolitan. The powers of Metropolitans are prescribed by the constitution and canons of the Provincial Synods. Their normal functions are to convoke and preside over the meeting of the Synod ; to convoke and preside over the Provincial House of Bishops when it meets as a court for the trial of a cause or for hearing an appeal ; to convoke and preside over the House of Bishops whenever it meets ; when a vacancy occurs in any see in the province, if no other provision has been made by the diocese, to appoint a commissary to administer the affairs of the see until the consecration of a new bishop. The Metropolitan takes order for the consecration of bishops and receives the resignation of bishops in the province. In Rupertsland he himself accepts the resignation. This arose from the fact that in early days communication between bishops in the province was difficult and long delayed. For the same reason there is a provision that if the office of Metropolitan should be vacant the duty of calling the Provincial Synod devolves upon the senior bishop whose residence is within telegraphic communication. In the other provinces he presents it to the other bishops for their action.

In Ontario the visitorial powers of the Metropolitan as they appear in the original Letters Patent are in part preserved. They become operative, however, only in emergency, and upon the reception by the Metropolitan of a memorial signed by two-thirds of the clerical and lay members of the Synod of the diocese concerned.

The Primate is elected by the House of Bishops of the General Synod from among the Metropolitans. He holds office for life. His powers rise out of the constitution of the General Synod, and are not defined in any canon. As president of the General Synod and, through the Synod, of all of the activities of the Church, the responsibilities and opportunities of his office are very great. The personality of our Primates has made them greater, their administration has proved of vast benefit to the Church, and they have won the gratitude and affection of all.

Conclusion. We have reached again the point from which we started.

In the formation of the General Synod the final step in self-government was taken. At the first session the Synod decided that the Primate should bear the title of Primate of all Canada, and that the Metropolitans should bear the title of Archbishop, each being designated Metropolitan of the province over which he presides, and Archbishop of the see he occupies.

The study of the long process of our development brings with it a realisation of the difficulties of the past, and of the problems and deficiencies which we still have to face. It is difficult to make our oneness felt as a real fellowship and spiritual power with our people comparatively few in number, separated by great distances and scattered over so great an area. In self-support we are only just awakening to ideals which ought to have been accomplishments long ago. For the future we are full of hope. We have canons and rules to suit our present needs, and an organisation which gives to every element of the community, to bishops and clergy and laity alike, in each parish and diocese, and in the Church as a whole, its legitimate place and function. The Church is autonomous, but the eager desire to remain an integral part of the Church of England in the Motherland, and in all parts of the world, which has marked every step that has been taken, has lost none of its force to-day. It finds expression in the 'solemn declaration' which stands at the beginning and forms an essential part of the constitution of the General Synod.

'We declare this Church to be, and desire that it shall continue, in full communion with the Church of England throughout the world, as an integral portion of the one Body of Christ, composed of Churches which, united under the One Divine Head, and in the fellowship of the One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, hold the one faith revealed in Holy Writ, and defined in the creeds as maintained by the undivided primitive Church in the undisputed œcumenical councils; receive the same canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing all things necessary to salvation; teach the same Word of God; partake of the same Divinely ordained Sacraments through the ministry of the same Apostolic Orders, and worship one God and Father through the same Lord Jesus Christ, by the same Holy and Divine Spirit, who is given to them that believe, to guide them into all Truth.'

IV

(vii) THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION: INDIA

By E. J. Palmer, sometime Bishop of Bombay

The Church which from March 1, 1930, was officially known as the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, was, in its beginnings, quite literally the Church of England in India. Sir Thomas Roe, when he went as the Ambassador of James I to the Emperor Jahangir in 1615–18, was accompanied by his chaplain, the Rev. John Hall, and, on the latter's death, wrote to the East India Company: 'Here I cannot live the life of an atheist. Let me desire you to endeavour me supply, for I cannot abide in this place destitute of the comfort of God's Word and Holy Sacrament.' The Rev. Edward Terry was sent in response to this appeal.[1] From that time onward there were always some chaplains in our 'factories' in India, and the provision of chaplains was imposed as an obligation first on the New Company in 1698 and then on the United Company in 1708. This obligation was discharged by the East India Company till its dissolution after the Mutiny, when it was taken over with the other obligations of the Company by the Imperial Government.

The Church thus begun was in fact, as well as in theory, an extension of the Church of England into India. It came into existence simply because a certain number of members of that Church found themselves in that country on the King's business or their own. But soon a wider outlook was adopted. The earliest Charter (of 1698) laid down that the chaplains ' shall apply themselves to learn the native language of the country where they shall reside, the better to enable them to instruct the Gentoos, that shall be the servants or the slaves of the Company, or of their Agents, in the Protestant Religion.' The next Charter affirmed the responsibility of the chaplains for all the Christian servants of the Company, of whatever race. Thus early was the idea admitted, which was destined to make the Church of England the mother of a Church of India. The Company for a long time took a friendly interest in missionaries, sometimes bringing them out, free of charge, in its ships. Clive was a great admirer and friend of Kiernander. It is true that in the latter part of the eighteenth century and the first decade of the nineteenth the East India Company forbade missionaries to work within its territories. This change of attitude was probably due to a temporary nervousness about offending Indian susceptibilities connected with the recent assumption of the responsibilities of government. Whatever its cause, it was brought to an end at the renewal of the Company's Charter in 1813. William Wilberforce and his friends insisted that the Act granting that renewal should stipulate that missionaries should be allowed to work in the Company's territories and also that the Company should provide a salary for a Bishop of Calcutta, if His Majesty should be pleased to send one out. Thus began the episcopacy which I have to describe in this essay.

---

[1] Quoted in *A History of the Church of England in India* by Eyre Chatterton, D.D., Bishop of Nagpur (S.P.C.K.), p. 5—a book to which I owe most of the historical information which is given in these pages, in so far as it relates to events before my own time in India.

My treatment must be largely historical. I have to speak of something which actually grew up, not self-consciously, nor exactly in absent-mindedness, but because of very definite and compelling circumstances. My judgment on this history is that out of these circumstances and the men who were sent to meet them, the One Spirit moulded again an episcopate on the same lines on which He had moulded the episcopate of the Primitive Church. Let me begin by trying to give, as it were, a bird's-eye view of the long development and of its principal stages.

The Dioceses. At first it was a travesty of episcopacy that was to be seen in India. But the blame for this must not be fixed wholly on the Indian arrangements. The episcopacy which England knew during the suspension of the Convocations (1717–1852) was itself a travesty of episcopacy, and incidentally this fact contributed much to that prejudice against episcopacy which still dominates the minds of many Free Churchmen. The isolation and the absolutism of a bishop without a Diocesan Synod and without Convocation, characteristic of the tradition brought from England by the early bishops, were bound to be exaggerated where so much needed to be done as in India, particularly as it depended upon the bishop whether it was done at all. But beyond that, the bishops were given such immense areas to supervise that the supervision could only be intermittent, and the bishop remained a person seen only at very rare intervals by most of his flock, while the diocese had no chance of a common life, nor had even its most important members opportunities of meeting one another.

Bishop Middleton, the first Bishop of Calcutta, had for his diocese all the Company's territories in India, together with the island of Ceylon and the British possessions in the Straits Settlements. To this charge, in the time of his successor, Bishop Heber (1823–26), Australia was added. The India Act of 1833 provided for bishoprics of Madras and Bombay, which were constituted in 1835 and 1837 respectively. The creation of the bishopric of Australia founded in 1836 further relieved the Bishop of Calcutta, as did that of Colombo in 1845. But even when these divisions had put an end to the open inanity of the ecclesiastical arrangements of India, the dioceses remained far too large in area for the development of diocesan life. For instance, in 1836, at Bishop Corrie's first visitation in Madras, twenty-nine out of forty-two clergy summoned had to be excused attendance. As years went on, the annexation of the Punjab, the Central Provinces, Oudh and Burma gave the Bishop of Calcutta a larger diocese than that of which Bishop Middleton had been called to take charge. Indeed the labours of the journeys imposed upon him killed one of the greatest bishops ever sent to India, Dr. Milman, before efforts were made to reduce the overwhelming burden.

Dr. Milman's death in 1876 was followed by the foundation of a number of new dioceses. Rangoon and Lahore received bishops in 1877, and Travancore in 1879. In the former year, two bishops were consecrated to assist the Bishop of Madras in Tinnevelly, which became a separate diocese in 1896. The Bishop of Calcutta was further relieved by the formation of the bishoprics of Chota Nagpur, Lucknow, Nagpur, and Assam in 1890, 1893, 1902, and 1914 respectively, and the Bishop of Madras by the formation of the Nagpur diocese just mentioned and by the creation of the Dornakal diocese in 1912. The bishops of Bombay, who had gained some relief by the foundation of the bishoprics of Lahore and Nagpur, still had charge of an area equal in extent to the British Isles, until 1929, when Nasik was carved out of it.

The dioceses in India have, for the most part, followed the civil divisions, as did the dioceses in the Roman Empire. At first the formation of new dioceses created charges only less unwieldy than those which they replaced. But in later years some dioceses have been formed which have the possibility of becoming real unities not beyond the powers of one man to supervise. Tinnevelly and Dornakal in the south, Chota Nagpur and Assam in the north-east, and Nasik in the west, are all of this more promising description. The work that has been accomplished—to name only two instances—by Dr. Foss Westcott as bishop in Chota Nagpur, and by Dr. Azariah as bishop of Dornakal, has shown episcopacy in something like its original apostolic character and its true power.

The Ecclesiastical Province. Three constitutional developments must now be mentioned. India became a quasi-province with the appointment of the two bishops of Madras and Bombay, who were to be in the same position in relation to the Metropolitan, the Bishop of Calcutta, as the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury occupy in relation to the Archbishop of that Province. This provision would have made India a Province, had it not been for the extraordinary addition to it, that the Bishop of Calcutta was to exercise his functions as Metropolitan 'subject nevertheless to the general superintendence and revision of the Archbishop of Canterbury.' However, the Act of 1833 and the

Letters Patent thereunder provided no procedure by which the Archbishop of Canterbury should exercise his 'general superintendence and revision,' and it was, so far as is known, never exercised. When Bishop R. S. Copleston told one of the successors of St. Augustine that he very gladly accepted his Grace's power of general superintendence and revision 'because it does not mean that your Grace can revise me in any *particular*,' the sentiment corresponded not only with the fact, but also with the judgment of the archbishop, and the smile with which he received the jest was as happy as that with which it was made. In effect, India was an ecclesiastical province, and we frequently used the phrase.

Provincial life began with the meeting together of the Bishops of the Province. The first of these 'Conferences' was held in 1863 under Bishop Cotton; the second under Bishop Milman ten years later. These Conferences were called meetings of the Episcopal Synod from 1900 onwards. Their purpose was to furnish the bishops with opportunities both of consulting one another and of giving advice to the Church. The latter they did sometimes by letters of exhortation to the whole of their flocks or to certain classes among them, and at other times by published statements of the policy which they agreed to pursue, or of the course which in their judgment the clergy or others ought to follow, in matters which were brought before them from time to time. It was the theory of the Synod that its declarations were always made as advice and not as command. Nothing was ever published unless the Synod was unanimous. In estimating the meaning and possibility of this custom, it is right to remember that the majority of great questions were settled by the fact that the ecclesiastical laws of England held good in India, and also that, under those laws, though individual bishops had coercive jurisdiction, the Synod had none—in fact it did not exist in the eye of the law. The Indian Church Measure gives a legal existence to the Episcopal Synod, because it is an assembly of the Church recognised in its constitution, but the Church has rightly refrained from turning this good custom of requiring unanimity in the Synod into a canonical regulation. It is one thing to feel bound in honour to go almost any lengths to secure unanimity ; it is quite another thing to give every single bishop a legal right to hold up the Synod.

Decision against having ‘ Suffragans.’ The second constitutional point which I wish to mention was among the earliest decisions of the bishops in India. It was the decision not to introduce into India the English system of so-called suffragan or assistant bishops. It arose upon a proposal—which, at the present day, thank God, sounds utterly incredible—that two assistant bishops should be appointed under the Bishop of Madras, one to supervise the S.P.G. missions in Tinnevelly and the other to supervise the C.M.S. missions in that district. The Conference of Bishops in 1873, which consisted of Bishop Milman of Calcutta, Bishop Gell of Madras, and Bishop Douglas of Bombay, rejected the proposal in a long resolution, of which the following words are those of most permanent importance :

‘ The appointment of mere Coadjutor Bishops is open to grave objections, inasmuch as—

‘ (*a*) Such Bishops would be without that freedom and independence of position which is essential to the due exercise of their office in a sphere of peculiar difficulty demanding the unimpeded exercise of every faculty ;

‘ (*b*) Their position as mere Curates, acting in entire subordination to the Bishop whom they assist, and only so long as he pleases, would render them in public estimation an inferior class of Bishops ; whereas the work of Missions, chiefly for the sake of which it is proposed that they should be created, should be treated as the noblest and most honourable in the service of the Church ;

‘ (*c*) They would almost necessarily be so closely connected with the respective Societies to which they had previously belonged that they would tend to separate by party distinctions those who are cordially united under one Bishop.’

This statesmanlike resolution was upheld during Dr. Milman’s episcopate, but not long after his death his successor, Bishop Johnson, impressed by the urgent need of Bishop Gell for episcopal assistance, and finding that in the intervening years nothing had been done towards arranging for a better solution, consented to what had been refused by Dr. Milman and Dr. Douglas. But the experiment was never repeated. As soon as the last of the two bishops then appointed died, one bishop was consecrated for the whole of Tinnevelly. In 1922 the Synod reaffirmed the policy of 1873, adding, however, that 'in some places it might be advisable to appoint assistant bishops as a temporary expedient, or as a step intended to prepare the way for a division of a diocese.' These two are the only conditions under which the appointment of an assistant bishop is allowed under the Constitution which comes into force this year (1930). The policy of the bishops in 1873 saved the Church from a danger which they may have foreseen. If the opposite policy had been adopted, there would have been a considerable temptation to appoint Indian bishops as assistants. If that had been done in a number of instances, before any Indian was made a diocesan, it would have become a cause of much ill-feeling to-day. At the same time the policy drove the authorities of the Church to find ways of dividing the dioceses, whatever the difficulties might be. And they were very great. The spheres of the three statutory bishoprics had been fixed by Act of Parliament or Letters Patent thereunder. There was no chance of getting legislation through Parliament to revise them. The expedient most often adopted was that, when the Episcopal Synod had approved of the formation of a new diocese, the incumbent of the old diocese out of which the new diocese was to be formed gave a commission to a bishop to act for him as his commissary in the area of the new diocese, and he and the other Bishops of the Province (and later the Council) undertook to treat the new bishop as a diocesan bishop, and the area of his charge as a diocese. The Government, though consenting to this procedure, continued to hold the Bishop of Calcutta, or Madras, or Bombay, as the case might be, responsible for all that happened in the new diocese. Extraordinary as this expedient was, it saved the situation. Diocesan life was developed in all parts of India, and there was only one kind of bishop ecclesiastically, and that the real kind.

Method of Appointment of Bishops. A few words may be welcome about the methods of appointing bishops, because this subject is now attracting attention in England. Up to the coming into force of the Indian Church Act, the bishops under Letters Patent (Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, Lahore, Rangoon, Lucknow, Nagpur) were appointed by the Crown on the advice of the Secretary of State for India; those under commission of a statutory bishop, as just explained, by the bishop giving the commission, the Metropolitan's concurrence being required if either of the other statutory bishops was the appointer; the Bishop in Travancore by the Archbishop of Canterbury; and the Bishop of Colombo by the Crown till the Church in Ceylon was disestablished in 1886 and thereafter by the Colombo Diocesan Synod of Clergy and Laity. The Crown appointments were made with the conscientiousness characteristic of British Sovereigns and their Ministers when faced by grave responsibilities. The statutory bishops made their appointments with expert knowledge; there is no reason to suppose that diocesan election would have discovered better men. Some of those bishops became, after years of administration, truly representative of their dioceses. But none of those in India started as the elect of the diocese, with the mass of the diocese pledged by the election to support him, and with the position of being the elected representative of the diocese in the councils of the Church.

In the new Constitution the diocese is to elect a bishop, if it can do so by a large majority; if it fails, the election goes to the bishops of the Province. But a diocese may, if it prefers, adopt a different method, under which the Diocesan Council chooses (by ballot) four persons, out of whom the Metropolitan and two other bishops of the Province named by the Diocesan Council appoint a bishop. This method appears to be favoured generally by Indian opinion, as providing a safeguard against factious contests, which in India might be caste-contests. It may be worth the consideration of the Church of England, because it should be less likely than direct election by the Diocesan Council to result in the appointment of the third or fourth best man because stronger men were too strongly opposed.

Synods and Councils. One further constitutional step must be noted, for it has had a great effect in producing the type of episcopacy which now exists in India. As early as 1877 the bishops in their Conference resolved 'that the time has come for taking steps to provide a system of synodical action, both diocesan and provincial, and that we undertake to ascertain the feelings of the clergy and laity of our several dioceses in regard to the constitution of Diocesan Synods.' The result was the establishment of diocesan conferences in several of the older dioceses of much the same sort as existed in England before the Enabling Act. Then the movement hung fire. When Bishop Copleston was called from Colombo to be Metropolitan in 1902, he began speaking all over the province of the necessity for real synodical action. In January 1913 the first steps were taken by the Episcopal Synod in consultation with assessors from all the dioceses, which led to the accomplishment of this aim. Bishop Lefroy, who immediately afterwards became Metropolitan, guided the movement with vigour. Diocesan Councils were established in every diocese, each of which includes all priests holding the bishop's licence and elected laity. A Central Council, at first called the Provincial Council, and now the General Council, which roughly corresponds to the National Assembly of the Church of England, came into existence in 1922. The passing of the Indian Church Act and Measure has given to these Councils legal position and actual power. The Councils have turned our episcopate in India into a constitutional episcopate. The nature and function of that constitutional episcopate are set down in the Constitution which was adopted in February 1930—a document which, because it aims at introducing novelties as little as possible, is to a large extent a record of the experience gained in the last hundred years of our Church's life. This Constitution has a great importance for the subject of this volume, for it is the most recent, and possibly the most elaborate, attempt that has been made in the Anglican Communion to describe episcopacy at work. This description has all the more importance because it is made with a practical, not a theoretical, purpose.

Bishops are in General Charge of the Church.

What then have been the outstanding characteristics of episcopacy in our Church in India?

The first characteristic of the episcopate in India has always been *Episkopē*, general charge, or superintendence. The bishops are travelling a great part of the year. Hard as this still is, it was incredibly hard in earlier times. Think of Bishop Heber's first visitation tour of fourteen months. Think of Bishop Wilson going twice in his episcopate to Penang and Singapore. Think of Bishop Milman literally killed by travelling. But this supervision was not merely supervision. It was encouragement. It was understanding. It was the formation of policy. It was leadership. It was in short not only episcopate; it was apostolate. The whole range of apostolic duty was there in India to be done, and the fact humbled—and exalted—the men who recognised it, who sought from God the power to do it, and, in doing it, found Him.

There was, and still is, a lack of many things in India. The whole work has always been tragically undermanned; and, up to now, it has been done under some conditions which were absurdly hampering and embarrassing. But what episcopacy means, what it is for, has long been clear in fact. If we try to state the theory which the facts embody, we shall find, I believe, that it is the same as that which was held and acted upon in the Primitive Church, and has, I gather, been preserved in the Orthodox Church to this day.

This theory is different from either of the two views of episcopacy, both inadequate, which are predominant in the Western world at this moment. One is the view that bishops simply exist to give valid orders and valid confirmation. The extreme instance of such a view was in the ancient Celtic Church in which bishops were subordinate members of the monastic orders, kept in the monasteries for these purposes, while the whole government was in the hands of the abbots. To-day a similar view, supported by the name of St. Jerome, has given the Papacy the chance of usurping to a great extent the authority of the bishops. The opposite view is that episcopacy is a form of government which is on the whole the most advantageous for the

Church. This is a view which many Protestants would find it quite easy to adopt.

In India neither of these views is current, because circumstances have led to the re-emergence of the more primitive, more spiritual, and more dynamic view. In this view the consecration of bishops is an act of God, giving men His Spirit and endowing them with grace and truth, in order that they may take charge of the Church, not as great men, but as men of God and apostles of Christ. They receive and take charge in a general sense, as did the Apostles. They go on delegating parts of that charge as the Apostles did, and to the same orders of the ministry to which the Apostles delegated it—that is the meaning of episcopal ordination—and the Lord behind them in every ordination imparts the necessary gift of the Spirit of power. They go on admitting every baptized person to the fullness of the sonship of God and of the brotherhood of the Church, and to that priesthood which is the duty and privilege of the whole brotherhood—that is the meaning of episcopal confirmation—and the Lord behind them in every confirmation imparts the necessary gift of the Spirit. They rule the Church, not as governors by official authority, but as leaders by the grace and truth that is in them. Men submit to that leadership willingly and without jealousy, as submitting not to men, great or little, but to the grace that they received in consecration. The bishops rule without ambition and without self-consciousness, as being concerned only for their Master, and that Master one Who cared for none but willing and convinced disciples, Who cared not to rule, though He was a King, but to serve, and thus only to come into His Kingdom. It is for that reason that bishops are willing to give and take counsel, to explain to Diocesan Synods and Councils what they wish to do, and even to postpone doing it until their explanation is understood and their policy accepted. Thus in respect of a possession, the possession of grace and truth—which is wealth beyond any earthly riches—they endeavour to follow in the steps of Him, Who, though He was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we through His poverty might become rich. Again, the office of a bishop is intensely personal, but can only be exercised rightly by selfless persons. All the while and every day the good shepherd is laying down his life for the sheep; and in general there is perhaps no more illuminating description of the bishop's office than that of shepherd.

The Gift of Grace. As I have already remarked, the circumstances of their charge forced the Indian bishops unconsciously back upon this original idea of episcopacy. I recall those whom I knew; I think of those of whom I have heard or read. Among them there were great men and small men—some possessed outstanding gifts, others very ordinary abilities. For sixty years they were almost all men sent out direct from England to be bishops in India, the only exceptions being a few Government chaplains already at work in that country. From the seventies of last century onwards a majority of our bishops have been missionaries, most of whom had learned, as superintending missionaries, something about the duty of superintendence. But, whatever they had been before, they found themselves put into this *general charge* of the Church, and by grace they performed it.

They gave themselves up, often recklessly, to an exacting life. In spite of the size of their dioceses, which prevented their flocks from having intimate knowledge of their shepherds, those shepherds, wherever they went, made a real impression of pastoral solicitude. The things which I most often heard related of them were acts of personal kindness, which the bishops themselves had probably long forgotten. I never remember to have seen a pompous bishop in India, nor one who was continually thinking and speaking of himself. They were curiously free of self-consciousness. I attribute all that to the fact that they had been driven to fall back on the grace of God alone, because the demands made on them were so overwhelming, and they had become absorbed in the working of God's grace.

The Gift of Truth. Beside the gift of grace, bishops receive at consecration a gift of truth. Let me give some examples of the leadership of the bishops in truth, in the sense of right judgment about the realities of the situation.

Bishop Middleton—the first of our bishops in India—quickly formed, and expressed, the opinion that what the Indians needed was a sound education in 'Arts,' which, he believed, would destroy the whole fabric of superstition in which they were imprisoned. He founded Bishop's College in Calcutta partly to offer such an education. Missions, and the Government, followed with more and more education of this sort. We see the fulfilment of his prophecy to-day. The only question is whether we can now effectively show Christ to the minds which, as Bishop Middleton foresaw, have been freed from the greatest obstacle to receiving Him. Then consider Bishop Daniel Wilson. Though he only came to India when fifty-three years of age, he travelled for a quarter of a century all over his diocese, everywhere stirring up the comparatively small congregations to build churches. But that is not the only instance of leadership for which he is rightly remembered. I will mention two of the others. Bishop Wilson had been one of the greatest Vicars of Islington, and much connected with the Church Missionary Society ; but when that Society attempted to withdraw their missions from episcopal supervision, he withstood them, and got them to admit every one of his contentions, his power to grant or withhold licenses to missionary clergy, his approbation or otherwise of the location of missionaries, and the superintendence of the missionaries as of his other clergy in the discharge of their ecclesiastical duties. It should also be remembered of him that he saw clearly and said firmly that caste was anti-Christian. Take next Bishop Cotton, his great successor. He saw at once and clearly the Church's duty towards the Anglo-Indians and the domiciled community, and initiated the great extension of education for their benefit. He saw too that if there was to be the reality of an ecclesiastical province, the bishops must meet together for counsel. The Conferences of the Bishops which he initiated became the Episcopal Synod.

From this date the leading of the episcopate was often expressed in the form of resolutions of the bishops in conference—or, as it was later called, the Episcopal Synod. The bishops frequently issued Pastoral Letters from these meetings. They set themselves early to arouse the English Church people in India to an interest in missions. This was a prominent topic in the Letters of 1863, 1873 and 1883. They called for intercessory prayer on this subject, and Bishop Cotton composed and issued the prayer for India which we still use. 'O God, Who hast made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth, and hast sent Thy blessed Son to preach peace to them that are afar off and to them that are nigh, grant that all the peoples of this land may feel after Thee and find Thee, and hasten, O heavenly Father, the fulfilment of Thy promise, to pour out Thy Spirit upon all flesh, through Jesus Christ our Saviour.' Well do I remember Bishop Lefroy commenting to me on this prayer, and remarking that the direction which the progress of the Gospel in India had taken was in exact fulfilment of the petition that 'the peoples of this land may feel after Thee and find Thee': to which I would add that the prayer has not been without influence on the spirit and conception of our missionary work in India.

The Pastoral Letters mentioned above contained direct exhortations on the same subject. That of 1863 (by Bishops Cotton, Gell, and Harding) addressed the chaplains of the English congregations as follows: 'Endeavour to impress your people deeply with the conviction that God has given to England this great Indian Empire, in order that we may communicate to India the glorious blessings of the everlasting Gospel. Seek to convince them too that every careless European Christian is a hindrance to the progress of that Gospel, and that every pious and consistent European is a promoter of it.' One of the signatories to this letter, Bishop Gell, in a Pastoral Letter to his own diocese of Madras, urged the European community to vigorous missionary effort and enterprise. The then Governor of Madras wrote to the bishop, expostulating on the ground that his Pastoral contravened the Queen's proclamation, and hinting that Government might have to interfere. The bishop replied in words which are remarkable both for their accurate definition of the neutrality of Government in matters of religion (which the honourable scrupulousness of British officials has often exaggerated) and for their perspicuous enunciation of Christian duty :

'I am much obliged to your Lordship for telling me of the light in which my Pastoral is regarded by the Government. I have not understood that religious enlightenment and persuasion are forbidden by any Order, but only interference with anyone in the exercise of his religion, favouring or disfavouring on account of it, the use of official power to turn a man from his religion, and similar acts. It is known quite well that we object to such action as strongly as possible, and there is no appearance of anything of the kind in the Pastoral.

'But we do think that all Christians, knowing that every Mahomedan and every Hindu was created by Christ, is preserved alive by Him every day, will be judged by Him, and may find pardon and salvation in Him, should use as he has opportunity, and discreetly, not offensively, the instruments of enlightenment and persuasion, not force, to make them willing partakers of this wonderful knowledge and all its blessings.'[1]

The appointment of Thomas Valpy French to be the first Bishop of Lahore in 1877 inaugurated the custom of choosing distinguished missionaries to be bishops in India. We feel no doubt now that the introduction of this change of policy at that particular time was due to God's Providence ; for the task of the Church in India had changed, or, to be quite accurate, its centre of gravity had shifted its position. There remained the care of the Europeans—urgent as ever—but there had been added the guidance of the Church towards the goal of doing for India what the Church of England had done for England. The Church of England in India accepted the call to build the Church of India. The conditions of the fulfilment of that vocation were stated in the Bishops' Pastoral Letter of 1883 with unfaltering clearness. Those who share the primitive belief that God gives a charisma of truth to His bishops, will see it evidenced in these words :

'We do not aim at imposing upon an Indian Church anything which is distinctively English or even European.

---

[1] Chatterton, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

The Word, the Sacraments, and the Episcopal Ministry,—these are unchangeable. They belong to no age or country. As they met the needs of Europe or of Asia many centuries ago, they will meet the needs of the India of to-day. But in regard to the conditions under which these are presented, the Church adapts herself, and we desire to see her adapt herself more and more, to the circumstances and to the tempers of every race of men; and from these, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, her forms of service, her customs, and rules and institutions will take an impress. We trust that God has given this mission to the Church of England, to give to India that pure Truth, and that divinely appointed Order, in possession of which India shall work out her own spiritual life, bear spiritual fruit of her own, contribute her own spiritual gifts to the wealth of the universal Church of God.'

So far I have spoken mainly of truth in a practical sense, that truth which is apprehended by understanding. There remains the other side of truth, which concerns God, and His Nature as revealed to us, and His Will towards men and about them. At the appointment of the Seven, the Apostles proposed to devote themselves to prayer and the ministry of the Word. The Church for many centuries looked on the bishops as the guardians of the truth revealed to her, and teaching remained long one of their most conspicuous functions. These duties are excessively interfered with by the size of Indian dioceses. But the moment the size of dioceses is reduced, bishops seize the opportunity for this work. Let me, for once, take the most recent instances. The Bishop of Dornakal to a great extent trains and instructs his ordinands himself, and arranges and controls the teaching given in the daily services for the simplest Christians in the villages. The Bishop of Nasik spends a section of the year with his ordinands and catechist classes, and himself gives some of the instruction. Such methods will be more and more adopted as manageable dioceses become more numerous.

Again, the responsibility of bishops for doctrine is reflected in our new Constitution. To this is prefixed a 'Prefatory Statement' 'concerning the inheritance and the ideals of this Church' adopted by the bishops assembled in Synod on February 11, 1928. It was drawn up in view of the dissolution of the legal connection of our Church in India with the Church of England, and in order to assist the faithful 'to distinguish the enduring from the transitory elements in their heritage, and to know what they should hold fast themselves and commend to others, as having value and significance not for one nation only, but for all the peoples of the world.' It was composed in a manner characteristic of our conceptions of the relations of the episcopate and the Church. After the draft had been first discussed by the Episcopal Synod with clerical and lay assessors, it was published for consideration and comment, and a good many comments were made. These comments were considered by the Synod and assessors, and it was revised in many particulars and republished as revised. Further comments were received, and it was again reconsidered, and somewhat altered before final adoption. The Statement is a statement of the doctrinal position and spiritual ideals of the Church. The bishops are responsible for it and have never attempted to shift their responsibility on to other shoulders, but they have worked in the preparation of it in collaboration with assessors formally chosen by the General Council, and they have invited, received and considered criticisms from the Diocesan Councils.

The Constitution contains provisions for the future issue of 'Determinations' and 'Statements' by the Episcopal Synod on matters of Faith and Order, which will be quoted later.

The remaining functions of the episcopate I propose to illustrate mainly from the provisions of the new Constitution of the Church.

The Bishops in the General Council. The supreme legislative authority is the General Council, consisting of three Houses, those of the bishops, of clerical representatives, and of lay representatives, and votes by orders are necessary in some cases and may always be demanded. Thus in the Council the bishops can prevent any proposal from being passed, but so can also the other clergy, or the laity. The bishops have a peculiar position in the Council. Any question of Faith or Order or any matter involving a question of Faith or Order can only be put to the vote in the Council for final acceptance or rejection in a form which has been settled by the House of Bishops sitting separately. In this form the responsibility of the bishops in matters of Faith and their *jus liturgicum* are constitutionally recognised.

The Episcopal Synod. Side by side with the General Council, however, the Episcopal Synod exists as a separate body for the fulfilment of those duties, belonging to the episcopate as an order, which must be discharged by the bishops acting together. These duties are thus defined in the Constitution (Declaration 4 (2)):

'The special functions of Bishops which are by custom performed wholly or to greater or less degrees by the Bishops of a Province acting together are—

'(*a*) to deal with questions concerning the Faith and Order of the Church as they arise, and to issue pronouncements or instructions thereon,

'(*b*) to judge such matters as a court of appeal from diocesan courts,

'(*c*) to supervise or regulate the public worship of the Church with a view to the advantage or the needs of the Province as a whole,

'(*d*) to confirm the election or appointment of persons to be Bishops of the Province, and through at least three of their number to consecrate them as such,

'(*e*) to enquire into all such cases as might lead to the suspension or deposition of a Bishop or to his being relieved of his duties, and, if they think necessary, to take action in that behalf.

'The action of the Provincial Bishops in regard to all these matters except (*d*) is subject to revision by properly constituted bodies of Bishops of more than one Province if such bodies exist; and pronouncements on Faith and Order by the Bishops of any part of the Church are subject to correction by the whole Church, when its opinion can be obtained.'

The manner in which the Episcopal Synod carries out its functions in regard to instruction of the faithful in doctrine is explained in Chapter XXV, Canon VII:

'By the ancient rule of the Church it is the normal duty of each Diocesan Bishop to teach the flock committed to his care, and of the Bishops of the Province, acting together in common council, to give instruction and advice to the whole body of the faithful under their jurisdiction. This office of the Bishops of the Province will ordinarily be fulfilled through the issue of occasional "Statements" addressed to the faithful by the Episcopal Synod. But so often as any grave question of Faith or Order shall arise, it shall be the duty of the Metropolitan to bring the matter formally before the Synod, and the Synod, if after due deliberation and after consultation with assessors chosen by the General Council for that purpose it shall seem good to it, shall frame a synodical "Determination" on such question. Any such Determination shall be taken as a formal exposition of the meaning of the teaching of the Church on the matter in question made by the highest authority having special responsibility in matters of doctrine available within the Church of this Province, but it shall not be made ground for disciplinary proceedings against any member of the Church until it shall have been, or except in so far as it shall have been, incorporated by the General Council into the Canons of this Church.'

A Determination may not be issued in the absence of assessors. We were advised by Professor C. H. Turner that the only persons who voted in the Provincial Synods of the early Church were bishops (or their representatives), but that clergy of all orders (including minor orders) were present and sometimes took part in the deliberations; and laymen were also present. By the presence of the assessors we return to these early precedents.

The Determinations of the Episcopal Synod are pronouncements of great authority, but only if the General Council incorporates a Determination or a part of one into a Canon does it acquire binding force, so that, for instance, a clergyman becomes liable to discipline for teaching contrary to it. Here again we were deliberately applying an ancient precedent. It was the principle that the decrees of a General Council gain œcumenical authority not simply from being passed by the bishops but from being accepted by the whole Church. We endeavoured to apply that principle to our provincial area under modern conditions. For I would submit that the representative institutions of the modern world provide a means, which the ancient world had not, of testing whether the pronouncements of the bishops are acceptable to the conscience of the Church, though, of course, no contemporary judgment can forestall the judgment of the unborn generations.

The Bishops and Public Worship. The only other function of the Episcopal Synod which may be of general interest to readers belonging to other Churches is that which concerns public worship. Up to March 1, 1930, the services of the Church were legally regulated by the Act of Uniformity. Bishop Wilson, when he drew up a special service with Proper Psalms and Lessons at the outbreak of the Indian Mutiny, commented thus upon his action: 'It is all illegal, I know, but I trust it will be passed over and forgiven, and that the extraordinary circumstances of the insurrection will warrant my taking this unusual step.'[1]

But as years passed the necessity for departing from the Prayer Book became apparent. In the extreme heat which often prevails, the British congregations needed shorter services. Everywhere the Indian congregations needed services more suitable to their character and attainments. The bishops had recourse to their inherent *jus liturgicum*, and issued the necessary instructions. They rightly kept control of the variations and rightly consulted each other. For instance, Dr. Lefroy, as Bishop of Lahore, submitted a long series of instructions for liturgical 'adaptation and enrichment' to the Synod, in order (as he explained) to discover whether his colleagues objected to anything which he proposed on grounds of doctrine or liturgical principle. He modified his proposals in certain points at the request of the Synod; but he was going to issue the instructions so modified on his own authority, had not his elevation to the office of Metropolitan intervened. Thus the elaborate Chapter (XXI) on 'the Services of the Church' is based on much experience. The principle is carefully stated in Canon II:

---

[1] Chatterton, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

'Canon II. The right of giving directions concerning the conduct of public worship and in particular concerning the words to be used therein, called in these Canons and Rules *liturgical authority*, belongs by ancient custom to the Bishops of the Church. The Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon recognises that its Bishops have liturgical authority, and regulates by Canon and Rule the methods by which that authority is to be exercised. While each Diocesan Bishop should exercise that authority in his own Diocese, yet since right and sound forms used in worship have great influence in maintaining the purity of a Church's faith, and common forms of prayer promote unity of spirit among those who use them, the conduct of worship in the several Dioceses is a matter of grave concern to the Province as a whole. The Church of the Province therefore recognises it to be the duty of the Episcopal Synod to act on behalf of the Province in the matter of the direction of public worship, and especially to secure that suitable forms of words for the most sacred and essential parts of worship shall be used throughout the Province, and to provide that the Diocesan Bishops may exercise their liturgical authority in constant consultation with each other and in such a manner as not to endanger the harmony of the Dioceses and the unity of the faithful. Further, inasmuch as public worship is the common concern of all who take part in it, the Church of this Province recognises not only that assessors should sit with the Episcopal Synod when it considers liturgical matters, but also that the General Council may constitutionally be called upon to concur in the action of the Episcopal Synod in grave matters relating to public worship, and enacts that the concurrence of the General Council shall be required for the adoption of any Book of Common Prayer to be authorised for the Province as a whole, and for any change in such a Book when once authorised.'

With regard to the 'liturgical authority' of the individual bishop, the Canons lay down certain classes of deviations from the Prayer Book of the Province and of forms of service outside it which the diocesan bishop may only authorise with the consent of the Episcopal Synod, and other classes of deviations or forms which he need only report to the Synod, the Synod having the right to call upon him to withdraw or amend them if they contain doctrine inconsistent with that contained in the standard book of Common Prayer and under certain other conditions. A very valuable provision is that a bishop may authorise (in some cases with, and in others without, the consent of the Synod) the experimental use of new forms of service, formal authorisation being delayed till actual use has shown the quality of the forms. For indeed real prayers cannot be written; they can only be made by being prayed.

Work of Diocesan Bishop. The Constitution of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon in Declaration 4 (1) defines in its prosy legal way the duties of a diocesan bishop within his diocese as follows:

'(1) The special functions of a Diocesan Bishop in the Holy Catholic Church which he has to perform within the diocese committed to his charge are:

'(*a*) to be a Father in God to all the Christian people and more particularly to the clergy, and to visit, teach, encourage and admonish them as a chief shepherd among the shepherds of Christ's flock, to lay his hands on those who are to be ordained to the ministry of the Church and on the baptised who are to be confirmed, to license clergy that they may minister and preach, to guide and direct the instruction of Christians and the evangelisation of those who are not Christians, to supervise the administration of the Sacraments and the performance of public worship, to consecrate churches, to excommunicate open and impenitent sinners, and to receive back excommunicate persons when penitent, and to secure the observance of the Canons and Rules of the Church as well by exercise of his jurisdiction as by the occasional use of his power of dispensation, that is to say, of suspending or modifying in special cases, if there seem to him good cause, the strict letter of the ecclesiastical law; and

'(*b*) to summon and preside over assemblies of the clergy and other faithful people in his diocese for consultation and common action concerning the things of God and of His Kingdom, such as are the Diocesan Synods and Diocesan Councils mentioned in these Declarations.'

Enough has already been said on most of the points mentioned in this part of the Declaration. But it seems advisable to add something on the exercise of discipline, and on the relation of the bishop to the Diocesan Synod and the Diocesan Council.

The Bishops and Discipline. The exercise of discipline is a real thing in a missionary church, and the bishops in India have always taken the place in this sad duty which the examples of the New Testament indicate to them. Here again the Constitution only gives the results of much experience. It states the principle in Declaration 24 :

‘ Forasmuch as it has ever been the duty of the Church, for the saving of the souls of sinners and the safeguarding of the Christian standard of life in faith and morals, to exercise spiritual discipline upon all its members, the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon has this duty within its boundaries and will exercise it with due regard to the inalienable authority of the Episcopate in this matter. But seeing that in the primitive Church the bishop exercised his disciplinary office with his presbyters as assessors and after consultation with his people, this Church determines that the authority of the Bishop in this respect shall be exercised in accordance with Canons and Rules of the General Council or of the Diocesan Councils adopted to that end.’

There are several forms of court, from the village *panchayat* upwards, which are in customary use. The general principle is that the court finds on the facts, and reports to the bishop, and he decides whether it is a case for excommunication. Similarly, report is made to him of the repentance and amended life of an excommunicated penitent, and to him belongs the joyful duty of deciding that he may be reconciled to the Church. Every bishop knows that it is only when a congregation genuinely takes its part that excommunication is real and penitence can be its result.

The Bishop and his Diocese. The personal relations of the bishop with individual clergy and laity have been already touched upon. But he has also relations of a most important kind with the clergy as a body, and others with the clergy and laity as a body. The first come to expression in the Diocesan Synod. This is the meeting of the bishop with his clergy to consider spiritual matters, such as pastoral care and missionary policy, matters of doctrine and matters of practice. The Diocesan Synod meets when occasion requires, or when matters are referred to it by the Episcopal Synod or the General Council. The Diocesan Council consists of the bishop, all licensed priests and deacons, and representative laity. It meets every two years to deal with all kinds of diocesan activities and business, and to consider matters referred to it by the General Council, or references which it wishes to make to that body. No resolution in the Diocesan Council can be passed except by the concurrence of the bishop with the Houses of Clergy and Laity. The bishop is not an autocrat nor is the Church a democracy. Each diocese is a unit: it is made up of the bishop and his clergy and people. The condition of the life of this unit is that they should act together. Christ is the Head of the Church. But He cares for no obedience to His commands but willing obedience, and for no co-operation of His Body but willing co-operation. If the bishop is the head of the diocese, ought he to demand more of it than Christ demands of the Church? No, his privilege is to be a source and a centre of unity, on the pattern of Christ. He must secure it, as our Lord deigns to do, by grace, truth, reasonableness, goodness, patience. Only so, and just so, can that saying be fulfilled, ‘ He that receiveth you, receiveth Me.’

Conclusion. Episcopacy in our Church in India has not been the result of theory, though I have stated in this chapter a theory of episcopacy on the basis of it. It has been developed, as I have endeavoured to show, as the result of a succession of circumstances, for which the Church was not responsible. The episcopacy which has emerged is, I venture to submit, the real episcopacy, and its ideal is the primitive ideal. It preserves the essential meaning of the apostolical succession, for the bishops have inherited and to-day perform the functions of the Apostles. (Apostolical succession which does not mean *that* is a name or a shadow.) Of those functions the first, which determines and includes all the rest, is the general charge of the Church, ἐπισκοπή. But the bishops perform all their functions as a college—that is, a company of colleagues.

(For that very reason our Lord took so much pains to check His Apostles' tendency to rivalry, jealousy, and ambition.) The unity of the Synod is one of the most precious inheritances of the Indian Province—and one of its most apostolic characteristics. Again, the bishop and the diocese are necessary to each other: they form one living unit by the will of God. They accept their correlative positions and the resulting duties as from Him, and therefore with that kind of happiness and naturalness which are attached by His appointment to natural relationships—as, for instance, those of a family. Finally, from the first to the present day, the Church of India has depended not on episcopacy but on the episcopate. It has not been supported and sustained by episcopalian principles or by rules about bishops, but by bishops. For the essence of this institution is a transmission of life through living men. 'As my Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.' 'He that receiveth you, receiveth Me.' 'Who is adequate for these things? It is God Who maketh us adequate ministers of the new covenant, not of the letter' (rules or theories) 'but of the Spirit, for the letter killeth but the Spirit giveth life.' But, if this divine purpose is to be fulfilled, the Church must so restrict its demands upon the time and strength of the bishops that they may be able like the Apostles to 'continue stedfastly in prayer and in the ministry of the word.'

IV

(viii) THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION : THE WEST INDIES

Dioceses of Barbados, Guiana, Antigua, Trinidad, and Westward Islands

By O. H. Parry, Bishop of Guiana

I. Origin of Present System. The Anglican Episcopate in the West Indies and Central America dates from 1842. Letters patent, dated July 24, 1824, constituted 'the Island of Barbados, Grenada, St. Vincent, Dominica, Antigua, and Montserrat, St. Christopher, Nevis, and the Virgin Islands, Trinidad and Tobago and St. Lucia, and their respective dependencies, to be a bishop's see, and to be called from henceforth the Bishopric of Barbados and the Leeward Islands.' No mention is made of Guiana : it may have been regarded as a 'dependency' of one of the islands ; it was, however, recognised by the bishop, who at his first ordination ordained the Rev. Bryan Nurse priest to serve in that colony.[1]

Further letters were issued on April 2, 1825, constituting two archdeaconries :

1. The archdeaconry of Barbados, including Barbados, Grenada, St. Vincent, Trinidad, Tobago, and St. Lucia, and their dependencies (with Guiana, actually).

2. The archdeaconry of Antigua, including Antigua, Montserrat, Dominica, St. Christopher, Nevis, and the Virgin Islands, and their dependencies.

3. By letters patent, issued May 11, 1826, 'the Colonies

---

[1] *Barbados Diocesan History*, pp. 4 ff. (Reece and Clark Hunt, London ; India Committee, 1826). The letters patent 'creating' the diocese are printed in full in Appendix iii. p. 133.

and settlements of Demerara, Essequebo, and Berbice were constituted parts and parcels of Barbados and the Leeward Islands'; by others, issued March 4, 1831, the three colonies were comprised in one colony under the name 'the Colony of British Guiana'; and thirdly, by letters patent issued on September 24, 1839, an archdeaconry was constituted in and over the colony or settlement of British Guiana.

William Hart Coleridge was consecrated Bishop of Barbados and the Leeward Islands, July 25, 1824.

Bishop Coleridge having resigned his see on April 6, 1842, the several letters patent, referring to British Guiana and Antigua, were revoked, and fresh letters issued August 21, 1842, constituting three dioceses:

Barbados: including Barbados, Trinidad, St. Vincent, Tobago, and St. Lucia.

Antigua: including Antigua, St. Christopher, Nevis, Virgin Islands, and Montserrat.

Guiana: having two archdeaconries, Demerara and Berbice.

By the letters patent issued in 1824 full power and authority was granted to 'confer the orders of deacon and priest, to confirm . . . and to perform all the other functions peculiar and appropriate to the office of a bishop . . . and by his commissary . . . to exercise jurisdiction spiritual and ecclesiastical in and throughout the said diocese . . .' And the bishop was constituted 'a Body Corporate' with perpetual succession. He was to be 'subject and subordinate to the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury . . . in the same manner as any bishop of any see within the province of Canterbury.'

By the letters patent issued for Guiana in 1842 power was retained to alter still further the limits of the newly constituted diocese with the consent of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops concerned. Due subordination to the see of Canterbury and the oath of obedience to the Archbishop as metropolitan are also ordained. The church of St. George is constituted a cathedral church, and the town of Georgetown made a 'city.'

Barbados, 1625–1824. Previous to the establishment of episcopacy the ecclesiastical supervision of the territory included in the above sees had been, as elsewhere in the colonies, in the hands of the Bishop of London, acting for the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Barbados was annexed probably in 1625, and in 1627 a royal patent was granted proclaiming 'the laudable and pious design of propagating the Christian religion.' From the beginning the form of ecclesiastical as well as of civil polity was strictly modelled on that of the mother country. The parochial system was adopted with vestries and parish officers; and the standards of worship, doctrine, and discipline of the United Church of England and Ireland were firmly adhered to. In practice the authority of the Bishop of London was not very much regarded, that of the Governor for the time being and the vestries under him being the only real source of discipline until the appointment of a bishop in 1824. It was on the strong representation of Dr. Howley, Bishop of London, that Mr. Huskisson, Prime Minister of George IV, recommended the establishment of a bishopric. The short quotation above made from the letters patent has now only an archæological interest, showing the heights to which the claims of the State to exercise authority in ecclesiastical affairs were capable of soaring in 1824. At any rate the State had a profound sense of the importance of dealing wisely in those critical days of the anti-slavery movement. Not only did the Crown choose with the greatest wisdom the bishops to be appointed: it provided them with every support that external dignity and authority could afford. To this is due the incalculable help which the Church was able to afford in smoothing the passage from slavery to freedom. Bishop Coleridge himself was an indefatigable traveller: four times he visited British Guiana; he penetrated 50 to 100 miles up two of the great rivers and the whole length of 200 miles of coast in days when there were very few and inadequate roads; and in eighteen years wore himself out with his labours all over his enormous diocese.

II. Appointment of Bishops.—Diocese of Barbados. This diocese has changed its constitution in Church and State less than almost any part of the British Empire. The island is still governed by vestries, and so the appointment of the bishop is still influenced by its constitution.

In 1870 the Secretary of State for the Colonies informed the Governor that 'Her Majesty will not be advised to create by her letters patent any new diocese or appoint a bishop to any existing diocese in the West Indies.' An Act of the Legislature of Barbados followed on June 12, 1872, providing that the Bishop of Barbados be selected by the Archbishop of Canterbury associated with the Bishop of London and one other bishop of the Province of Canterbury, on the application of the Speaker of the House of Assembly and the President of the Council ; the Archbishop and bishops were to be requested to consecrate, if the person chosen were not already a bishop ; and the appointment was to be by commission under the hand and seal of the Archbishop.

In 1891 the Cathedral Chapter, which had been created in 1886, was 'through their Dean' associated with the Speaker and President of the House of Assembly to approach the Archbishop of Canterbury in the event of a vacancy of the see ; and on December 21, 1911, an Act was passed authorising the Diocesan Synod to elect a bishop, or delegate the selection to persons outside the diocese, provided that the Primate of the province be added to those to whom the selection was delegated ; in either case a two-thirds majority of each order of Synod was necessary.

The present procedure is governed by an Amendment of the Anglican Church Act (1911–14) passed March 29, 1927. This provides that the election of the bishop shall be by a majority of each order of Synod, and requires that the appointment be confirmed by the Governor in executive committee before the name of the bishop-elect is submitted to the bishops of the province ; also that should a bishop not be elected, or should the election of a bishop not be confirmed (by the bishops of the province, or the Government in executive committee) within one year of the official declaration of the vacancy of the see, the Governor in Executive Council may appoint without right of appeal.

The Province at large. In the remaining dioceses of the province the election of a bishop conforms to the Provincial Canon, which provides that :

1. The selection of a bishop shall be subject to confirmation by a majority of the bishops of the province.

2. The Archbishop of the province shall provide for the consecration of the person appointed, if he be not already in episcopal orders.

3. If the diocese fail to choose a bishop within six months after a vacancy has been officially declared, the Archbishop shall provide for the selection of a bishop by the bishops of the province.

4. If the majority of the bishops of the province refuse confirmation, the Archbishop shall require a fresh choice; if the bishops refuse to confirm the second choice, the Archbishop shall request and empower the Committee of Reference (provided for under Provincial Canon IV) to choose a bishop, which choice shall be final.

5. Where the choice of a bishop is delegated to persons outside the diocese, the Archbishop shall be added to them.

Diocese of Antigua. The election of a bishop is by the 'Synod as constituted at the last ordinary meeting and called together within three months after the vacancy has occurred.' 'The Synod shall be called together by the Dean, or failing the Dean, one of the archdeacons in order of their seniority.' The Synod may 'delegate its powers of election to a committee.'

Diocese of Guiana. Canon XII, section 1 (1), provides 'Whenever a vacancy in the see has been formally signified by the Archbishop to the secretary of Synod or to the person for the time being administering the diocese, that person shall within fourteen days after receiving the formal signification, summon the (diocesan) Council, who shall forthwith call an assembly of the persons who were members of Synod at the last annual session for the purpose of providing a bishop for the see' (note that this provides that the electors shall have been themselves elected before the vacancy occurred).

The Assembly shall first elect a president, and then determine whether they shall elect a bishop or delegate the selection to any person or persons outside the diocese, and whether that selection shall be subject to confirmation by the assembly or not.

Voting shall be by orders, and election shall be by not less than two-thirds of the votes of each order.

The text of the relevant Provincial Canon is directed to be printed as an appendix to the Diocesan Canons.

The Diocese of Trinidad. Canon IV provides for 'a meeting of the clergy and lay representatives' of the diocese as does the canon of the diocese of Antigua, regardless of the date of their election as members of Synod. It agrees with the canon of the diocese of Guiana in requiring a two-thirds majority.

The history of the Church in Trinidad previous to the consecration of the first bishop, Richard Rawle, June 29, 1872, is somewhat different from that of the other dioceses. From its discovery in 1498 until its annexation by the British in 1797 it was under Spanish rule; but between 1783 and 1797 some 18,000 immigrants, most of whom were French, were induced to settle in the island, only Roman Catholics being admitted. The English guaranteed the privileges, religious and financial, of the Roman Catholics; and the annexation was acknowledged by the Treaty of Amiens in 1802.

The predominance of the Roman Catholic element has persisted. In 1801 the first ecclesiastical record occurs, a baptism by the Rev. J. H. Clapham, Brigade Chaplain. Next year he became the first rector of Port of Spain, and was married by the Governor, there being no Anglican priest available. Even in 1837, after forty years of British rule, there was only one church connected with the Church of England in the island, namely that which was built in 1823, and is now the cathedral.

In 1871 a Church Council was formed, and its first act was the unanimous election of Richard Rawle, principal of Codrington from 1847 to 1864, as the first bishop. The election of the bishop is, according to the canon, by a majority of two-thirds of the members of each order of Synod, and is subject to confirmation by a majority of the bishops of the province.

The Diocese of the Windward Islands. 'Bishop Mitchinson was consecrated and commissioned 1873 to be the Bishop of the Anglican Church in the Colony of Barbados with power, given by the Act (Barbados) which regulated his salary and status, to undertake, if invited, the episcopal charge of the other islands which had made up the old diocese of Barbados. Tobago had formally invited Bishop Mitchinson to do so, and he had consented. Eventually all the islands invited his supervision, and his commission was enlarged in each instance by a supplementary commission from the Archbishop of Canterbury. This, however, constituted a merely personal union which after the death or resignation of the bishop would be at once dissolved. The bishop, in consequence, in his first charge addressed to these islands, advocated formal separation by royal warrant from the old legally constituted diocese of Barbados. This was agreed to by the several church councils, and St. Vincent, Grenada, and Tobago were, in 1879, incorporated by law into the diocese of the Windward Islands. St. Lucia is not incorporated in this diocese; it is separated from Barbados by royal warrant and consists of congregations supervised by the Bishop of Barbados.'

Until 1927 the diocese of the Windward Islands was administered by the Bishop of Barbados. At the Synod of the diocese held in April 1926 the opinion was unanimously expressed 'that the time had arrived for making an effort for carrying out the original intention' (that it should be administered by its own bishop). It was resolved to bring the matter before the Provincial Synod for 'their sympathetic assistance and advice'; but also to obtain an assurance that, should the diocese find it impossible to make or to continue to make the necessary provision for the maintenance of their own bishop, the Bishop of Barbados would be pleased, with the permission of the Government of Barbados, to resume the administration of the diocese. On March 19, 1927, Bishop Berkeley (retired Bishop of Barbados) was unanimously elected by the Synod to hold the see in conjunction with the rectorship of the cathedral church of St. Vincent.[1]

III. Synodical Government: Relation of Bishop to Clergy and Laity. The relation of bishop to clergy and laity is governed by canons. So long as bishops were appointed by letters patent it was supposed that the ecclesiastical law of England was in full force. The case was complicated by the claims of the Colonial Governments, especially where, as was generally the case, the clergy and other Church officers were wholly or in part paid by them, and appointed or nominated or confirmed by the Governor. In 1870, as stated above, it was decided to issue no more letters patent, and to cease grants from the consolidated fund on the demise of the actual incumbents. This emphasised the need of forming a representative governing body, (1) to regulate the affairs of the dioceses under the bishops; (2) to elect bishops; (3) to make voluntary provision for the financial needs of the dioceses.

---

[1] *Barbados Diocesan History*, pp. 43, 64.

Barbados. In 1850 Bishop Parry formed an 'Ecclesiastical Board for the purpose of conference and consultation on matters affecting the external well-being and efficiency of the Church: with the bishop and eleven rectors (including the archdeacon) were to be associated a lay deputy from each parish, chosen by the vestry, the chancellor of the diocese, and a magistrate nominated by the Governor . . . and every member of the board to be necessarily a communicant of the Church'; it was, of course, a purely voluntary body. In 1874 Bishop Mitchinson, without reference to this 'Ecclesiastical Board,' said, 'My first visitation synchronises with the first meeting of the Church Council, or, to speak more accurately, the Church Convention of this colony. The Church Council of this island has been called into being in obedience to the suggestion of the West Indian bishops put forward at their first meeting in Georgetown, British Guiana, in 1873 that, with a view to unity of action and uniformity of discipline, separate church councils should be formed for each island and its dependencies, while for the present the formation of a Diocesan Synod was impracticable.' In 1883, at the suggestion again of the bishops of the province, formed in 1883 at a meeting in Jamaica, with Bishop Austin of British Guiana as Primate, the Church Council was converted into a Synod to harmonise with the other dioceses of the province. In 1911 the Synod was definitely established by an Act of the Legislature. It consists of the bishop as president, all the clergy of the diocese holding a licence from the bishop, certain ex-officio members and lay representatives who must be communicants, the number of laymen being not less than the number of clerical members. The Synod is a corporate body with the right to hold property, but it has no legislative power; the final authority lies with the Legislature of the Island.[1]

Appointment of Clergy. After the formation of vestries in the middle of the seventeenth century, all appointments to parishes were made by the vestries, as being responsible for the stipends of the ministers (paid by fees, and a levy of so much sugar or tobacco on every acre); but at an early date the Governor claimed to make all ecclesiastical appointments 'as Ordinary of the Island,' and representative of the King. By the Church Act of 1873 the right to present to rectories was conferred on the bishop and his councillors. Another Act passed in 1827 set up a board consisting of the bishop as chairman, a member of the Legislative Council, two members of the General Assembly, the rural dean of the district, the churchwarden of the parish, one member of the vestry, and two delegates of the congregation; these latter must be members of the Church of England, but it is explicitly stated that they need not be communicants. Nomination is made by the bishop in case of a rector, by the rector in case of a vicarage or curacy. If the vacancy lasts more than six months, the Governor in Executive Council has power to fill it. There are eleven parishes in the island; all its affairs, both ecclesiastical and civil, are administered by the vestry annually elected; it levies rates for both the maintenance of church fabrics and for the roads, and the rector is chairman. The Government therefore wishes to keep a close hold on the appointments. There are twenty-eight daughter churches with vicars. All clergy, including the bishop, are paid direct from the Treasury, and under regulations as Government servants, and qualify for Government pensions. The official title of the Church in the diocese seems to be 'The Anglican Church in Barbados.'

The Synod having no legislative power, there are no disciplinary canons governing the relations of the bishop with the clergy and laity.

---

[1] *Barbados Diocesan History*, pp. 42, 49.

The work of the bishop is thus described by the present diocesan: 'The island of Barbados is one of the most densely populated spots in the world; its area is 162 square miles, and its population 160,000, of which about 10,000 are white, the rest African descendants from slaves imported in former days. When it is remembered that not a century has passed since emancipation, the advancement of the black people is remarkable. The great work of the Church is to assist in their future development, spiritual, moral, intellectual, and industrial, and so prepare them for the time when the affairs of the island will be largely, if not entirely, in their hands.

'Barbados is a land of boards and committees. This together with the fact of a dense population in a small area and of the very close association between Church and State, peculiar in the world, makes the work of the bishop approximate more closely to that of an English diocesan than is the case with the other West Indian bishops. He is ex-officio member of many boards and is expected to serve on innumerable councils and committees. A large portion of his time is therefore taken up with the consideration of affairs by no means strictly ecclesiastical. Since, however, salvation is concerned with the whole man, body, mind and spirit, it is a cause of profound thankfulness that the advice and help of the Church is sought in every department of human activity. The opportunity is great, and the responsibility correspondingly heavy.'

Antigua. By Act No. 7 of the Legislature of the Island (1873) the Church was 'disestablished,' and the authority and jurisdiction of the bishop as conferred by the letters patent granted to Bishop Davis in 1842, was recognised. In 1884 the first Diocesan Synod was held, and passed a constitution and canons. The Church in the diocese is called 'The Church of England in the Diocese of Antigua.'

The Synod is constituted as follows: All beneficed and licensed clergymen, the chancellor, the trustees, the treasurer, and one communicant lay representative from each parish or church council, elected by the vestry. There is a canon providing for a vote by orders (of which the bishop constitutes one) which secures to the bishop a veto on synodical legislation.

The Diocesan Council is the executive council of the Synod; it consists of the bishop, the officers of the diocese, two clergymen and two laymen from each of the archdeaconries, elected by and from the members of Synod. The Synod is the final authority for defining or altering the boundaries of parishes; there is no other duty specifically assigned to the Synod; but by various canons it is constituted, either itself or through the Diocesan Council, the final authority on matters in dispute arising in vestries, on all questions of diocesan and parochial finance. Canons of the Synod deal also with (1) candidates for holy orders; (2) lay readers; (3) special services; (4) sponsors at baptism; (5) marriage.

The relation of the Bishop to the Clergy is defined by canons on the appointment of incumbents and on clergy discipline. Appointments are made by the bishop with the concurrence of the vestry or church council of the parish or cure; but, if there be no concurrence for twelve months, the appointment lapses to the bishop. Ecclesiastical offences are dealt with first by a Commission of Enquiry, if the bishop sees fit, the commission being chosen by nomination of the bishop. The court consists of the bishop or his vicar and three clergymen of not less than three years' standing, with a legal assessor for matters of doctrine; for other offences two laymen are added. The sentence is given by the bishop, but in matters of doctrine an appeal lies to the Provincial Court of Appeal.

There is no canon on the discipline of the laity. The happy traditions of this diocese seem to show that canonical or legal enactments are not desiderated in this relation.

The bishop—at present also Archbishop of the West Indies—thus describes a working day:

'There is an element of blessed uncertainty as regards the bishop's working day. He may be practically all day at his desk, except for Mass and devotions, meals and a brief siesta. He may, in addition to correspondence and other administrative work, be in charge of a parish and doing a parish priest's work. He may be toiling on the deep in a ten- or fifteen-ton schooner ; he may be going from church to church by car or motor boat or on horseback ; he may be spending days inspecting hurricane ruins, consulting with builders, checking estimates or specifications for reconstruction work, or even superintending the work itself.

'He will certainly spend many hours of many days on entering and making up accounts (" this business," Acts vi. 3) and writing cheques. He has meetings, secular and ecclesiastical, to attend or preside at.

'On many days he will be called upon to " say a few words." He will above all find it difficult to spend adequate time in " exercising himself in the Holy Scriptures," and other necessary study, especially as he is not as young as he was, or so able to sit down to serious reading at nights after a long working day.'

Guiana. Bishop William Piercy Austin was appointed by letters patent in 1842 ; he kept his episcopal jubilee in 1892, and died the same year at the age of 85. At least as early as 1860 he summoned meetings of both clergy and laity to consult with him ; from 1864 printed records of the 'Diocesan Synod' are extant. He had been accustomed even earlier to meet the clergy and address a charge to them ; in 1860 he urges the 'annual meeting of a Synod,' to which the laity should be invited, thus following the example set by Bishop Parry, although with little success, in Barbados in 1850, in forming an 'Ecclesiastical Board.'

In 1870 the action of the Colonial Office, in announcing 'disestablishment and disendowment' by the Imperial Government, emphasised the need of organising diocesan government. The 'Synod,' which in 1865–6 had drawn up a simple constitution with rules of order, was ready to respond to the call, and in 1870 a committee was appointed to report on the organisation of the Synod. A scheme was presented in 1872, and passed. A very strong protest was entered by a minority of the clergy against the inclusion of the laity, and led to a prolonged debate in 1873, when a proposal to annul the resolution constituting a Synod was registered. In the same year the bishops of the West Indian dioceses met in Georgetown under the presidency of

Bishop Austin, and prepared the way for the formation of the Provincial Synod. An Act of the Legislature also legalised the Diocesan Synod, together with its constitution and rules.

In 1905 an ordinance was passed at the request of the Synod itself, repealing all previous ordinances, especially that of 1873, in order that the Synod might be free to make canons and regulations, and also creating 'The Incorporated Trustees of the Church in the Diocese of Guiana.'

At the same time the Synod drew up a body of canons, which have been amended and revised in 1912, 1919 and 1926. Thus all restrictions on the legislative powers of the Synod were removed. The Synod 'has power to make such rules, regulations and canons as may from time to time be necessary for the general management, discipline and good government of the Church, and for administering the property and affairs thereof.'

The declaration of principles is similar to that of most colonial dioceses, except that there is no reference to the Thirty-nine Articles. The canons, etc., are called 'of that part of the Catholic Church known as the Church in the Diocese of Guiana in the province of the West Indies.' The lay representatives are elected by the registered electors of each parish, being those who have communicated three times and paid their church dues during the previous year. A majority of the votes of the members of Synod, together with the assent of the bishop, is necessary to give validity to any act; voting may, and for the election of a bishop must, be by orders. A very important clause is the following, which dates from the old 'Constitution and Laws' of 1872: 'The bishop may give notice that he requires reasonable time . . . to consider whether he shall give or withhold assent to any act which has received the majority of votes of the members of Synod.' All committees are appointed by the bishop: two trustees are elected by Synod, the third is the bishop exofficio. There is a *Diocesan Council*, half the members of which are appointed by the bishop; it exercises during a vacancy all administrative powers vested in the Synod by the bishop; it acts as the executive council of the Synod; it advises the bishop on the alteration of parish boundaries. The bishop has sole authority as regards church buildings ; but the consent of the Council is necessary for any sale, mortgage or long lease of property.

The appointment of the clergy is in the hands of the bishop exclusively ; his relation to them is governed by a canon on discipline, which is practically the same as in other dioceses. There is a canon on the discipline of the laity, based on the second and third rubrics of the order of administration of the Lord's Supper. There are no canons dealing with the spiritual government of the diocese. From the very beginning the most deliberate care was taken to guard the independent spiritual authority of the bishop. This happy state of things is enhanced by the entire freedom of the Church from any State interference whatever. At the same time the Government, when an Act was passed in 1921 disendowing the Church gradually in twenty years, paid over in Government bonds a capital sum producing over £3500 a year in lieu of an annual grant, and still continues to make an annual grant of about £1500 for missionary purposes. Other ecclesiastical bodies receive proportional grants.

Appeal from the bishop's sentence in case of conviction of a clergyman for false doctrine or breach of ecclesiastical order lies to the Provincial Court of Appeal.

The bishop's time is divided between Georgetown, visits to coastal parishes and extended tours up the five great rivers. His assistance is constantly required during vacancies or vacations of the clergy, and not infrequently he has actual charge of a parish. The administration of finance and diocesan business having been for many years admirably organised, he has little to do in that direction, but there are important monthly meetings of the Diocesan Council and board of missions to preside over, as well as committees. The missionary work within the diocese is very extensive, there being 113,000 East Indians scattered all along the 200 miles of coast, mostly working on sugar or rice estates ; and also five large missionary districts, where priests work among the aboriginals of the interior, in addition to three isolated aboriginal missions visited by parish priests. Visits to these missions take from two to three weeks each, and are made by steamer, launch or canoe. The constant supervision of the parishes, interviews and correspondence all take time; while the fact that the bishop has, through the clergy as managers, control of all the ninety-eight Church schools in the diocese, adds considerably to his labours.

Trinidad. The Church of England in Trinidad having been disestablished on February 15, 1870, a Representative Body consisting of the clergy and lay deputies elected by the several congregations of the said Church in the island was constituted. By royal warrant dated April 24, 1872, the island was separated from the Diocese of Barbados, and Richard Rawle became bishop. Thereupon the Representative Body constituted a 'Council of the Church of England in the island (otherwise called the Diocesan Synod).' Canons were drawn up in 1872; they have been amended from time to time, and are now under revision for a reprint.

The Synod consists of the bishop, diocesan officers, the clergy, and one or more lay representatives in proportion to the subscriptions of each parish or congregation to the sustentation fund; the lay representatives must be communicants and subscribers of not less than twelve shillings to the sustentation fund. The assent of the bishop and a majority of the members present shall ordinarily be necessary to an Act of the Synod; voting by orders may be required by the bishop or by any two members of Synod, a majority of the votes of each order being required to decide a matter; by this a veto is secured to the bishop. The Synod has power to appoint committees and boards, the bishop having power only to fill vacancies with the advice of the Diocesan Board.

The Diocesan Board consists of diocesan officers, four clergymen and three laymen elected by the Synod.

'All baptised persons claiming to be members of the Church of England shall be acknowledged as such'; all such persons paying not less than half their church dues (one shilling a month) have the right to vote for lay representatives of Synod and for members of the vestry.

The relation of the bishop to the clergy is but lightly touched upon by the canons. There is a canon of the discipline of the clergy substantially the same as in the other dioceses. Appeal from the sentence of the bishop to the Provincial Court of Appeal is allowed in the case of conviction for false doctrine only. The bishop has power (by Canon VII, 14) under certain circumstances, other than scandal or ecclesiastical offences, to issue a commission to report on the facts, and if, on consultation with the Diocesan Board, he thinks fit, he may relieve the clergyman of his charge with six months' notice (this seems a very unusual provision). There is no canon on the discipline of the laity.

There seem to be no canons governing the appointment of clergymen ; it is in the hands of the bishop.

There are canons dealing with the Missionary Board, the Board of Education, the Boys' Industrial School, chaplains of public institutions and the Orphan Home.

Canon IX forbids persons ' known to be leading an immoral life ' to be admitted as god-parents at Baptism or Confirmation.

The same allows publication of banns to be dispensed with by a formal licence from the bishop.

Dioceses of Jamaica, Nassau and Honduras

The Province of the West Indies falls into two very definite groups, originating one from the Diocese of Barbados, the other from that of Jamaica.

I. Origin of the Present System. By letters patent, issued July 24, 1824, at the same time as those issued for Barbados, the King constituted ' the Island of Jamaica, the Bahama Islands, and the settlements in the Bay of Honduras and their respective dependencies to be a Bishop's see, and to be called from henceforth the Bishopric of Jamaica.'[1] The establishment of the see of Jamaica was attended with far greater difficulties than that of Barbados, just as the travail pains of emancipation there were far more severe than in the southern islands and Guiana. The first Act of the Legislature regarding the Church after Bishop Lipscomb's installation on February 11, 1825, decreed that ' all such laws, ordinances and canons as are now used in England, so far as relates to the due ordering and ecclesiastical regimen of and jurisdiction over the clergy, shall be in force within this Island.' The Act was renewed in 1836, 1847, and 1858. The jurisdiction of the Governor over the 'lay inhabitants' was not interfered with, nor was any jurisdiction, spiritual or temporal, over them granted to the bishop; the Governor also retained the right of presentation to vacant livings.

---

[1] *The Diocese of Jamaica*, by Rev. J. B. Ellis, M.A. (S.P.C.K., 1913).

In 1861 the See of Nassau was created, comprising the Bahamas, Turks Islands and Caicos Islands. Further reductions were made when in 1864 Jamaica was created a Crown Colony. The first act was to discontinue the annual appropriations from general revenue to parochial vestries; then, a suggestion of concurrent endowment not having met with approval, a disendowment act was proposed; and in 1870, the year in which the Secretary of State for the Colonies announced that no more letters patent would be issued, nor grants made from the Consolidated Fund, he also wrote that 'he had received no protest from the bishop and members of the Church against the disendowment act, and therefore he would advise the Crown to allow it.'

The Clergy Act was not renewed, and thus in June 1870 the connection between Church and State came to an end, and the first Synod of the Church of England in Jamaica was held on January 13, 1870.

Nassau was constituted a diocese by letters patent in 1861, the Rev. Charles Caulfeild being consecrated the first bishop. Disendowment followed disestablishment in 1870, and a representative Governing Body was formed which called itself 'The Synod of the Church of England in the Diocese of Nassau.' This body petitioned for and obtained in 1875 from the Government legal authority to meet and make regulations for the general management, ordering and discipline, and to raise funds and to hold property. The Synod was also authorised to appoint any number of persons 'The Incorporated Trustees of the Church of England in the Bahamas.'

Honduras. The origin of the episcopate in Honduras is somewhat complicated; its history is given at length in Dr. Lowther Clarke's 'Constitutional Church Government in the Dominions, etc.' pp. 261, 288, 301.[1] In 1750 the Jamaica Assembly sent a missionary to the Mosquito coast; S.P.G. continued the work in 1767 and onwards, and in 1847 the King of the Mosquito Indians was confirmed in Jamaica (Blewfields, his capital, is in the modern state of Nicaragua). In 1862 the settlement of Belize was constituted the Colony of British Honduras, and in 1880 the Church in British Honduras 'organised itself on the basis of a separate diocese,' and elected Dr. Tozer, Bishop of Jamaica, to be its bishop. Dr. Tozer resigned shortly after. The Archbishop of Canterbury in 1887 asked Bishop Nuttall to reorganise the diocese of Honduras; this was done in 1883, Bishop Nuttall occupying the see until 1891, when Dr. Holme was consecrated Bishop in Barbados.

The diocese was constituted into 'a separate bishopric and diocese' by an act of the Archbishop of Canterbury as 'primate of the Anglican Church existing in British Honduras' and of the Bishop of London 'to whom belongs by law or custom the jurisdiction over the Church of England in Her Majesty's foreign possessions wherein no other provision in that behalf is otherwise made.' By this instrument were recognised as valid (1) 'the function of a Diocesan Synod assumed by the coadjutor-Bishop of Jamaica (Dr. Courtenay) and the clergy and certain lay members of the Church on the disestablishment of the Church in the colony of British Honduras' in 1872; (2) 'the declaration, canons and regulations established by such Synod of the said Church held February 21, 1883.'

By an instrument dated January 10, 1894, of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, at the request of the Provincial Synod of the West Indies, the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Honduras was extended to include all states and territories on the east seaboard of Central America between British Guiana and Costa Rica. A further extension was made in 1895 to include the state of Panama and the parts of Columbia accessible from the east. But in 1906 this further extension was relinquished and handed over to the jurisdiction of the American Church.

---

[1] See also *The Diocese of Jamaica*, pp. 88, 129 f.

II. Appointment of Bishops. — Jamaica. Three canons, containing seventy-seven articles, regulate the election of a bishop and of a coadjutor or assistant bishop.

The election is by a special Synod called within six months after the official notice of a vacancy, which shall either elect a bishop or delegate the selection to the 'English Committee of Reference,' with whom is associated the Archbishop of the West Indies; this election is final. Election is by a clear majority of each order, but if there be not a majority of more than two-thirds of all the votes cast, 'it is open to not less than one-third of the members voting to submit their objections to the Primate,' to whom a written statement must be sent by the President of the Synod with his certificate of the election.

Appointment of Coadjutor or Assistant Bishop. On the bishop notifying his desire for an assistant bishop, the Synod shall decide (1) whether such assistance is desirable and necessary; (2) whether, if it decides it to be necessary, the bishop to be elected shall have right of succession or no; that is whether he shall be assistant or coadjutor bishop.

Any member of Synod may nominate if the election be for a coadjutor bishop; or the election may be delegated as in the case of the election of a diocesan bishop, excepting that, if it be delegated to the English Committee, the Bishop of Jamaica as well as the Archbishop shall be added to the Committee; or it may be delegated to the Archbishop and the Bishop of Jamaica and others; or to the bishop alone.

If the election is to be of an assistant bishop, the bishop of the diocese nominates.

Nassau. Nomination for election as bishop proceeds from the clergy, who shall first agree by a two-thirds majority on the name to be submitted to the vote of the laity. If the lay vote be negative, the clergy must make a fresh nomination, and so on until a two-thirds majority of both orders is obtained. Either before such nomination, or after failure to elect, the selection of a bishop may be referred by a two-thirds majority of each order to *any person or persons outside the diocese*, subject or not to the subsequent approval of the Synod. Special provision is made, in view of the scattered character of the diocese, to secure as far as possible a voice in the election to those of the clergy who are unable to be present at the election.

Honduras. The bishop is normally elected by the Diocesan Synod. A clear majority of both clergy and lay representatives must be present, and ' a two-thirds majority of each order present shall be necessary.' If the Diocesan and Provincial Synods cannot agree, the appointment is to be made by the Archbishop together with an English Committee of Reference.

Alternatively, the Diocesan Synod may delegate the election *ab initio* to the Archbishop together with any committee they may choose.

III. Synodical Government: Relation of the Bishop to the Clergy and Laity.—Jamaica. Since 1658 Jamaica has been in undisputed British possession. In 1661 General O'Oyley, the first Governor, was instructed to ' encourage ministers that Christianity and the Protestant religion according to the Church of England might have due reverence and exercise.' The Island was, like other colonies, under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Bishop of London, without whose license no minister was to be received into Jamaica. The Jamaica Assembly, then as always, firm in its independence, decreed that this jurisdiction gave no power whatever to inflict ' any penal mulct or punishment in any case whatsoever.'

The ' jurisdiction ' of the Bishop of London over the clergy had always been somewhat shadowy, and in 1799 the Assembly passed an enactment transferring it to ' persons resident in the island to be nominated by the Crown ' ; this was in consequence of a suggestion by the Attorney-General in England that such persons would be more competent, seeing that a Colonial Governor could not have ' intimate knowledge of the nature and exercise of the pastoral office.' Five of the principal rectors of parishes were in consequence chosen as Commissaries in 1880. To supply the due supervision of an increasing clergy and to support the cause of emancipation the bishopric of Jamaica was constituted in 1824.

After one hundred and sixty years of ecclesiastical anarchy and civil control it proved no easy matter for Bishop

Lipscomb in 1824 to obtain the due recognition of his spiritual authority from the established clergy of Jamaica.

As we have seen, the establishment came to an end in 1870. The position was promptly met by Bishop Courtenay, who had been appointed Bishop of Kingston as coadjutor when Bishop Spencer had been compelled by ill health to leave the island in 1854. He summoned the clergy to meet him, each accompanied by one suitable communicant layman, chosen by himself or by the communicant members of his congregation; the bishop himself invited twelve laymen. The business of the meeting was to formulate a constitution and provide a financial scheme for the diocese. The Governor immediately refused to recognise the proceedings on the ground that the meeting had been representative—and that often only by nomination—of the communicant members only of the Church. A law was passed, therefore, in June 1870, authorising a constitution to be framed, and regulations to be made, and fixing constituencies to elect lay representatives—electors being not necessarily communicants—for a Synod. To this the bishop, under protest, consented.

The canons were enacted gradually, and now fill some 160 octavo pages. The Church in the Island is styled 'The Church of England in Jamaica'; the 'ultimate appeal lies to the Church of England' in 'all matters affecting the fundamental doctrines or discipline of the Church'; and the 'English Committee of Reference' is the final court of appeal.

Lay representatives in Synod must be communicants; they are elected by the 'communicants' of the parish and by such 'non-communicants' as have signed a declaration that they are baptised and belong to no other religious denomination; these must have been registered and have paid their Church dues for at least three months before the close of the year previous to election.

The bishop has the right in all spiritual matters to vote as a separate order. If in a matter 'affecting the doctrine, discipline, ritual or constitution of the Church the bishop dissent from the majority of two-thirds of the other orders' he shall, on request of the orders so voting, refer the matter to the Provincial Synod ; if it concur with the bishop, the resolution is negatived ; if it concur with the other orders, the bishop may refer the matter to the English Committee of Reference, whose decision shall be final.

The Incorporated Lay Body consists of four lay communicants appointed by Synod.

The Diocesan Council is appointed by and from the Synod to be its Executive Council ; of the members appointed annually, half are appointed by the bishop, half by the Synod.

There are three archdeaconries and fourteen parochial councils, representing the fourteen civil parishes into which the Island is divided. Each church has its 'church council,' elected by the registered electors for Synod ; the members must be not less than eight or more than twelve, of whom eight must be communicants.

Appointment of Clergymen. Congregations who have provided a minimum stipend for three years previous have the right to nominate an incumbent. In the case of a congregation not having so provided, or of the bishop not agreeing with the nomination, or of no nomination being made within six weeks, presentation is made by the 'Committee of Selection' consisting of the bishop, three members of the Diocesan Council appointed annually by the Synod with the consent of the bishop, and three representatives elected by the Church Committees concerned. The bishop has the right to decline to appoint the person so selected, but it is not clear to whom the final decision belongs. A canon provides for the 'removal of clergymen' on grounds not 'disciplinary.'

Two long canons deal with the 'Discipline of the Clergy' and the 'Discipline of the Laity' ; they conform to the form of such canons in the province, except that the former includes provision for the appointment of a Commission of the Diocesan Council, under certain circumstances, to inquire into the conduct of the bishop ; and the report of the Commission is to be forwarded to the Primate to be dealt with according to the provincial canon of the discipline of bishops.

Other canons concern deaconesses who may be set apart by the bishop, honorary lay readers and catechists, candidates for holy orders; others concern forms of prayer, special services, shortening of the services in the Prayer Book; 'other minor matters are left to the direction of the bishop.' There are canons 'of the law of marriage and divorce,' 'of burials.'

It is to be noted that the English Committee of Reference is recognised explicitly as a final court of appeal somewhat frequently in the canons of the Church in Jamaica. The other dioceses are content with accepting the said Committee as constituted in accordance with the provincial canon thereon.

Nassau. On the disendowment of the Church in the Bahamas, the bishop, clergy and representatives of the laity formed a representative governing body called 'The Synod of the Church of England in the Diocese of Nassau.' In response to a petition from this Synod, legislative authority was given in 1875 to meet and make provision and rules then and from time to time for the constitutions of the Synod, 'the general management, ordering and discipline of the same, and of the communion of the said Church . . .' for raising funds and application and disposal of property. An indefinite number of persons was to be nominated by Synod to be 'the Incorporated Trustees of the Church of England in the Bahamas.' In 1891 it was provided that 'the members of the Diocesan Council shall alone constitute the Corporation.'

The canons are short, not more—excluding Canon I on Standing Orders of the Synod—than 38 pages of large printed octavo. Voting in the Synod is by orders, excepting in the election of the secretary, of the chairman of committees and of the Diocesan Council, as also when in committee of the whole Synod. All committees are appointed by the bishop, the Synod having the right reserved to propose the increase of the number of members of a committee; 'no motion dealing with the business of the Synod may be proposed from the chair.'

Lay representatives must be registered laymen, who have during the last two years 'communicated three times in the year at the least.'

Electors are the registered members of congregations, who must have contributed church dues during the previous year, or, being communicants, have been excused in whole or part payment of church dues.

The Diocesan Council consists of the bishop with six clergymen and six laymen, elected by and from the members of Synod, the archdeacon, if resident in New Providence, being ex officio one of the six clergymen.

Vestries are formed of the incumbent, together with one churchwarden appointed by him and six others elected by the registered members of the congregation of sixteen years and upwards ; all the seven must be communicants and at least three of those elected must be males.

There is a canon on abridgement of services and supplementary services, which may be authorised by the bishop.

The appointment of clergymen is (1) by presentation of the vestry where the maintenance is wholly or mainly provided from funds administered by the vestry. If no presentation is made within nine months, the bishop, with the consent of the council, shall appoint, and at the end of twelve months he shall appoint absolutely ; (2) by the bishop, where the maintenance is provided by funds at the disposal of the Diocesan Council.

The office of Dean of the Cathedral is vested in the bishop, unless he elect to appoint the rector of Christ Church to be Dean.

Honduras. The 'solemn declaration' of the Synod declares it to be a true Diocesan Synod 'of the Anglican Communion in the West Indies' and desires that 'it shall continue in full communion with the Anglican Communion throughout the world, as an integral portion of the one Body of Christ.' All reference to the Church of England is avoided.

Lay representatives in Synod must be registered communicants of twelve months' standing. Those entitled to vote for them must declare that they are 'members of the Anglican Communion' and that they are baptized.

Voting in Synod is by orders, with the assent or otherwise of the bishop.

There is a *Standing Committee*, consisting of the bishop, the diocesan officials, all the clergy, and eight laymen, chosen four by the Synod and four by the bishop.

There is a *Corporate Body* of three laymen elected by the Synod to be the trustees for the diocese.

Clergy are appointed by the bishop, but in self-supporting parishes the consent of the churchwardens and church committee is necessary.

Provision is made for discipline in regard to both clergy and laity. The former are to be tried by a Diocesan Ecclesiastical Court. They have a right of appeal to the English Committee of Reference in cases of doctrine or ritual, but not in cases of morals. The laity are to be dealt with under the provisions of the first three rubrics of the Communion service of the Book of Common Prayer. If the bishop is brought into the matter, he must order an inquiry to be held by the Standing Committee before proceeding to confirm the action of the clergyman who has repelled a communicant. There is no appeal from the bishop's decision and he has power to compel any communicant to give evidence at the inquiry on pain (apparently) of excommunication.[1]

---

[1] A good popular account of the Church in the West Indies is *English Church History of the West Indian Province*, by F. P. Luigi Josa, Vicar of Christ Church and Archdeacon of Demerara (' The Argosy ' Company, Georgetown, 1910).

IV

(ix) THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION: AUSTRALIA

By Frederick Goldsmith, sometime Bishop of Bunbury

To the student of the evolution of Greater Britain and the United States of America, a comparison of origins and of the resultant growth and expansion is profoundly interesting.

In the United States we see the influence of stern reaction from the ecclesiastical and political principles of Stuart rule. Immigrants to Canada found already in possession a considerable population, French in nationality and Latin in religion. In South Africa, Dutch Protestants form a majority of the white population even to this day, and all round the English and Dutch settlers were thousands of coloured people, uncivilised and pagan. These conditions created the manifold and varying problems with which, in each case, Church and State have had to contend.

The settlement of Australia in 1788 was attended by circumstances of a wholly different nature. The soldiers and convicts (to the number of about a thousand) who landed on the eastern coast were in the first place not voluntary settlers at all, but men acting strictly under orders. They found no white people in possession, and the aborigines did not to any considerable extent influence the course of Australian history. But, from the very first day, the Church was confronted with problems—some special to the country, some universal in all young communities—the solution of which is in some cases far from complete to-day, after an interval of nearly a century and a half. Nor need this be a cause of astonishment.

The British Government of those days only thought of Australia as a dumping-ground for criminals. It was no small consideration that 12,000 miles of ocean intervened, and consequently the return of the criminal was rendered practically impossible. These men themselves were on the whole a very wild, rough crowd, although it is true that some among them were sent out for trivial offences. The soldiers were apparently undisciplined—a fact which would be specially marked after a monotonous voyage of eight months. Such were the first settlers, and so indifferent in the eighteenth century were the British authorities to any consideration of the reform of the criminal that it was not their intention to send even a chaplain. Happily, through the intervention of Bishop Porteus, at the last moment a young priest, Richard Johnson, was appointed.

The second difficulty, as settlement grew, was that of distance. In order to minister to a handful of people, it was often necessary for the clergy to travel in tremendous heat and through uncultivated country for hundreds of miles. It is not always remembered that the area of Australia is actually greater than that of the United States of America. These journeys took heavy toll of time and health.

The third difficulty, later in time, was caused by the gold rushes, especially in the fifties of the nineteenth century, to Victoria, and in the nineties to Western Australia. Everybody was unsettled, men poured into the country from abroad, those in regular occupations deserted home and business, and for a time, in the case of Victoria, lawlessness abounded. Everything was sacrificed in the hope that men might obtain vast wealth in a day.

Later still came the promulgation of the White Australia policy, one result of which is that Australia is considerably more than 90 per cent. British, and more than 40 per cent. Anglican, in both respects a great contrast to Canada and the United States. The most conspicuous difficulty with regard to this policy is concerned with the settlement of the tropical regions of the north, which are quite impossible for white women and children.

For many years the bishops were groping for a constitution for the Church. The very name that it acquired, 'The United Church of England and Ireland in Australia and Tasmania,' was ridiculous and might easily have become a serious handicap. Nobody knew what powers were conferred by the letters patent, which for some years were the source of authority to the bishops, and were ultimately (as in South Africa) found to be valueless. In addition many years were occupied later in endeavouring to loose 'the nexus' by which, according to the highest legal opinion both in England and Australia, the Church was not a Church in communion with the Church of England, but (though not established) was 'actually part and parcel of the (established) Church of England.' There were also the ever-present difficulties concerned with education and marriage.

The foregoing sketch will, in a small degree, reveal the problems which awaited solution by the Church.

No religious service accompanied the inauguration of the settlement in 1788, and very little encouragement was vouchsafed to the chaplain. Indeed, when with his own hands he built the first church of wattle and daub, it was burnt down. He was himself earnest and conscientious, but apparently a man without personality. The first stone church was built in 1800 by Governor Hunter.

The second chaplain, Samuel Marsden, was at once a devoted missionary and a capable farmer. He, unlike his predecessor, was a man of weight, and was appointed a magistrate. The two offices of pastor and magistrate were, however, incompatible, and he is better known for his interest later in the Maoris of New Zealand than in the people of Australia.

The first real advance towards any organisation was made in 1829, when William Grant Broughton was appointed to succeed Marsden as chaplain, and a Mr. Scott, who had been the first archdeacon. Broughton was a man of intense devotion and untiring energy; he travelled far and wide wherever settlers were to be found, and made himself thoroughly acquainted with the needs of the country. The six priests working under him were altogether insufficient. The Government, in 1820, had withdrawn all grants in aid, and he himself—an archdeacon in the diocese of Calcutta nominally—realised, that for any forward movement a bishop in Australia was absolutely essential. As testimony to his far-sightedness, great progress was made. He visited

England and was consecrated bishop in 1836, and before his death, seventeen years later, there were no less than 150 clergy working in the country. Nor was this all. His diocese at first included New Zealand and Tasmania, and these were both constituted separate dioceses in his lifetime, new sees being formed also, in 1847, in Melbourne, Adelaide, and Newcastle.

Bishop Broughton (who had now become Bishop of Sydney and Metropolitan, instead of Bishop of Australia) realised that the Church was still without any sort of constitution, and that at any rate some sketch must now be made to ensure a satisfactory result. He therefore summoned his five comprovincial bishops to Sydney in 1850, to discuss the problems with which the Church was faced, and to make recommendations to the authorities at home. The result of their deliberations was embodied in a report drawn up by the Bishop of Newcastle.

Being doubtful whether they were empowered to act as a Synod, they resolved not to act in that capacity but merely to state their conclusions.

1. They regarded themselves as bound by the canons of 1603–4.

2. They were of opinion that properly constituted Synods (provincial and diocesan) were essential in order to frame ‘ Rules of practice and Ecclesiastical order,’ and ‘ to conduct the processes necessary for carrying such rules into effect,’ but with no power to alter the Authorised Version of the Bible or the Prayer Book.

3. The status of the clergy and the discipline of bishops, clergy and laity were considered, only laymen ‘ in full communion as required by the rules of the Church ’ being regarded as eligible to sit in Synods and Conventions.

4. The bishops were steadfast in maintaining the Church’s Marriage Law, as expressed in the 99th Canon, and the penalties for infringement in accordance with Canons 26 and 109 and the rubrics in the Prayer Book.

5. On the subject of Holy Baptism they asserted the doctrine of regeneration as expressed in the Prayer Book, but on this subject Bishop Perry of Melbourne made a separate statement less definite.

6. They refused to have anything to do with schools where 'any system of erroneous, defective, or indefinite religious instruction was given.' In the case of universities being established, they regarded Church colleges as necessary.

7. Finally they established 'the Australian Board of Missions, Domestic and Foreign.'

The assembled bishops (especially Bishop Perry of Melbourne) were all sturdy Evangelicals. It is, therefore, all the more interesting to note their strong adherence to the Canons and the Prayer Book, to a strict law of marriage, and definite religious instruction, and their emphatic desire that every act and purpose should be consistent with Catholic tradition and custom. On these principles the work of making a constitution proceeded.

For the next five years the bishops were in continual correspondence with the Archbishop of Canterbury, who introduced a Bill in the House of Lords empowering the overseas branches of the Church to manage their own affairs with certain necessary restrictions. The Bill, however, was thrown out in the House of Commons, and finally the Australian dioceses determined to act independently, but as far as possible with due regard to the law so far as they could ascertain it.

The establishment of responsible government in some of the States made the absolute rule of bishops apart from the co-operation of clergy and laity 'an intolerable anomaly.' At this period also the Civil Courts declared letters patent to be 'ineffectual to create any jurisdiction ecclesiastical or civil within the colony.' The dioceses must therefore act, but they did not all adopt the same method to obtain authority.

Bishop Selwyn of New Zealand was the leader of those who claimed that the Church as 'a voluntary spiritual society' could make its own constitution by what became known as 'consensual compact'; and on that basis New Zealand acted. Bishop Short was Bishop of Adelaide, and his diocese was the first in Australia to agree upon and adopt 'Fundamental Provisions and Regulations' for 'the more effectual development and combination of the sympathies and energies of the Church in the support and extension of her Ordinances and Administrations'; and to enable the bishop to be 'aided in his Episcopal Authority by the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese.' Consensual compact on these lines was accepted in Convention in 1855, and similar action was taken by the bishops in Queensland and later in Western Australia.

In Victoria, on the other hand, it was decided that the constitution must be embodied in an Act of the Local Legislature. 'We can do nothing,' said Bishop Perry, 'without the assistance of the Legislature,' and the necessary Bill received the Royal Assent also in 1855. Tasmania followed in 1858.

In New South Wales there was an acute difference of opinion. Bishop Tyrrell, of Newcastle, after some years of hesitation, pressed earnestly for proceeding by consensual compact, as the Legislative Council would not accept the proposals of the Church without amendment. Eventually the Legislature passed an Act to enable the Church to manage its property only, and all other matters were embodied in a constitution which was placed on record in the Supreme Court.

In 1853 Bishop Broughton died while on a visit to England. As the Chief Justice of New South Wales said, 'No man ever went down to his grave carrying with him more deservedly the respect and veneration of his fellow colonists.' When he first came he found at least 25,000 convicts and more continually arriving. There were very few churches, and these mostly quite unworthy buildings. He enlisted the active and generous support of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. It was to his advocacy that the founding of the first bishopric was due, and his labours effected the establishment of five additional sees. He fought hard against undenominationalism in the schools and, later, against preference to Roman Catholic schools. He made solemn and public protest against the intrusion of a Roman Catholic Bishop of Sydney, on the ground that there was already 'a lawful Bishop of Australia according to the canons and usages of the Church.' In 1847, no less than three additional Australian bishops were consecrated in Westminster Abbey, Bishops Tyrrell, Short, and Perry, all of whom in different ways left their mark on Australian Church history. Bishop Broughton's last important act was the summoning of the Episcopal Convention in 1850. He never spared himself and was always mindful of the missionary as well as the pastoral responsibilities of the Church. He even attempted to learn some of the dialects of the aborigines and to make an aboriginal grammar, though, with so much pioneer work to do, he was not able to effect much in this direction. But to his foresight, industry, and Churchmanship, Australia of to-day owes an immense debt.

His death marks the termination of the first period of Australian history, both ecclesiastically and politically. Within a very few years responsible government was granted to all the States except Western Australia. In 1850 transportation of convicts to the eastern States was terminated. About the same time the gold rush began in Victoria, and the population increased by leaps and bounds. Further ecclesiastical subdivision became urgent.

Owing to the distance from South Australia, it was impossible for Bishop Short of Adelaide to do more than pay two brief visits to Western Australia, and in 1856 the see of Perth was established, with Archdeacon Hale of Adelaide as first bishop (1857). In 1859, Queensland having been made a separate State, the first Bishop of Brisbane was consecrated. Goulburn followed in 1863, Grafton and Armidale in 1867, and Bathurst in 1869, all in New South Wales. In all these cases considerable impulse was given to the work of the Church—a fact which harmonises with the general experience that dioceses limited in size, and enabling the bishop to maintain closer touch with his clergy and laity alike, always show better, and in some cases remarkable, results.

In one matter there has been in several dioceses a lack of foresight, perhaps of courage. With the exception of Brisbane, and possibly Adelaide, the cathedrals of Australia have lacked dignity and spaciousness. St. Andrew's, at Sydney, is a conspicuous example. It was probably built too soon, and certainly in too great a hurry. Unfortunately it stands in striking contrast with the Roman Catholic cathedral in the same city. It is crowded round with buildings, and its seating capacity is quite inadequate, while its interior affords small opportunities for functions such as the meetings of General Synod. It was consecrated in November 1868, and seven of the eight Australian bishops were present.

Bishop Barker was now Bishop of Sydney, and a convention of the bishops was held to carry on the work of the previous convention in 1850. The bishops issued a report drawn up by the Bishop of Goulburn, in which they set forth their opinions:—That 'the present relation to the Church at home is one of identity of doctrine and worship and of subjection to the law of that Church so far as it is applicable to an unestablished Church,' and that 'this relation may be best maintained by a system of diocesan and provincial Synods,' a common court of appeal, and a council of reference.

They then referred to the manner of appointment of colonial bishops, claiming that the mode of election should be decided in each case by the diocesan Synod, with confirmation by the Australian bishops.

There followed recommendations with regard to the constitution and functions of a General Synod of Australia, a tribunal to be constituted by the aforesaid Synod, and a council of reference, consisting of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, and a layman, together with two bishops and two laymen elected by the several branches of the Colonial Church. It is notable that this was preferred to reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; though the latter still remained the ultimate authority in some of the dioceses. Other matters considered were a tribunal for the trial of a bishop, the oath of canonical obedience by bishops to the Metropolitan, and the resignation of cures by the clergy.

At last, in 1872, the first session of General Synod was held, representing eleven dioceses; a constitution was adopted and the missionary territory of New Guinea was incorporated in the province. The first great objects always in the mind of Bishop Broughton and the bishops generally were now attained, viz. entire freedom from State control and unification.

In the next ten years three more dioceses were formed, with their centres as far apart as Ballarat in Victoria, Townsville in North Queensland, and Riverina in New South Wales.

In 1880 the question of religious instruction in elementary schools was again under discussion. The battle for State aid to Church schools had been fought and lost, and the Roman Church (much to its credit) was the only religious denomination maintaining its own elementary schools. The State regarded all religious organisations with impartiality and therefore could give no *definite* religious instruction through the State-paid teachers. A concession was, however, made in New South Wales, which allowed authorised religious teachers of all denominations to give to the children of their own denomination definite instruction in school hours. This concession was subsequently extended to Tasmania, Western Australia, and Queensland. It is well to be able to affirm that, though in the large cities the magnitude of the work and in the bush districts the scattered population caused great difficulties, yet, on the whole, the clergy, assisted by earnest lay co-workers, have struggled manfully to use this opportunity. In this they have been constantly fortified and encouraged by the bishops, who fully recognise the importance of the work. The concession was not won without (in some cases) hard fighting against the combined forces of the secularists and the Roman Church. Victoria and South Australia are still without it.

The year 1898 saw the establishment of two more dioceses, viz. those of Rockhampton and New Guinea, followed by Carpentaria in 1900. With the advent of the new century, great advance came in Western Australia. The diocese of Perth extended over 975,000 square miles, and the Synod appointed a committee to formulate a scheme for its subdivision. This resulted in the creation of the diocese of Bunbury in 1904, North-West Australia in 1910, and Kalgoorlie in 1914. These were ultimately formed into a province with Perth as the archdiocese.

Willochra (in South Australia) followed in 1915, and Grafton and Armidale, which had been one diocese, was subdivided.

This further development in the organisation of the Church has special importance, because it coincided with the federation of the six States of Australia in one Commonwealth. History has once more repeated itself. As in the case of the old country, the Church was *one* step in advance of the State, and by its diocesan and general Synods it 'blazed the trail' for the State and Federal Parliaments.

In 1900 an attempt was made in General Synod to effect a change in the name of the Church, and the debate demonstrated that the mischief was much more than a mere matter of an absurd nomenclature. It was discovered (as mentioned earlier) that the Church in Australia was actually a part and parcel of the Church of England. Dr. Micklem (in his 'Principles of Church Organisation') has pointed out that she is 'ultimately subject to the Church of England, subject to the authorities which legislate for that Church, and subject to the decisions of courts before which matters of dispute are brought concerning the Church in England.' This relation is contrary to all our principles, because the Australian Church is entirely unrepresented in the parliament or convocations of England, and actually is prevented by law from pleading before those very courts by whose judgments she is bound. This is known as the nexus, originally, indeed deliberately, chosen as a bond of union with the Mother Church, but entirely unacceptable to a people realising more strongly every year its nationhood and independence. Australia seeks only to share that which the Episcopal Church of Scotland, the Church of Ireland, the Church in S. Africa, and now the Church of India enjoy.

In 1921 General Synod passed the second reading of a determination to dissolve the nexus and render the Australian Church autonomous. Unfortunately there was very determined opposition from the diocese of Sydney, and as coercion of the mother diocese is, of course, out of the question, the matter was referred to the diocesan

Synods, which (with the exception of Sydney) have approved, and the difficulty, which relates principally to the establishment of an appeal tribunal, still awaits settlement. It is unfortunate that Archbishop Donaldson (now Bishop of Salisbury) has left Australia and Archbishop Riley has died, both of them having taken a leading part in the deliberations which have for so many years now taken place.

The Australian Church has never questioned that the authority of a bishop has its source in his Divine commission, and that his consecration is a sacramental act conveying grace for the execution of his functions. The Preface to the Ordinal in the Prayer Book, and the services themselves, are the official expression of the fact, and have always received whole-hearted acceptance. He is no mere organiser, no mere machine for confirming and ordaining, but is in the fullest sense a Father-in-God. From that convict settlement which was the shame of Britain have sprung in less than a century and a half twenty-five dioceses; the original taint had entirely disappeared many many years ago. The Church itself is animated by a vigorous life. The Mothers' Union, the C.E.M.S., the missions, and the manifest growth of real devotion witness to the faithfulness with which, as a rule, the bishops have fulfilled their duties.

The relationship of the bishop to both priest and layman is much more fully realised than is possible in a country like England. The dioceses are of course in population much more limited. The bishop travelled until recently very generally in buggies or sulkies. He would be for perhaps days at a time sitting beside a young priest, saying the daily offices, and camping at night with him in the bush. Possibly, when an accident occurred, he might have to act as blacksmith's assistant to his more mechanically trained companion. So, also, he would know intimately the farmer or miner in his home when he shared in the always generous hospitality of the bush. He could be, and very often indeed was, a true father to his people.

Life is changing in many respects. The motor car has mocked at distance. The 'wireless' has largely put to flight the loneliness of the way-back settler. Bishops in the most extensive dioceses are already discovering the use of the aeroplane. What is before us God alone knows.

To-day we who love Australia may well thank God for the past, and look forward to a future which shall manifest as fully all that His grace can do, with a strong hope that bishops, priests and laymen alike may respond with an ever-growing devotion and perseverance.

Bibliography

'Constitutional Church Government in the Dominions Overseas and in Other Parts of the Anglican Communion.' By Henry Lowther Clarke, D.D., D.C.L. (London, 1924.)
'Principles of Church Organisation, with special reference to the Church in Australia.' By P. A. Micklem. (London, 1921.)
'The Constitutional History of the Australian Church.' By R. A. Giles. (London, 1928.)
'Australia' ('Handbooks of English Church Expansion'). By A. E. David. (London, 1908.)
'A Parson in the Australian Bush.' By C. H. S. Matthews. (London, 1908.)

IV

(x) THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION: NEW ZEALAND

By J. M. Steward, sometime Bishop of Melanesia

The Anglican episcopate in New Zealand owes its constitutional form to the genius of George Augustus Selwyn, the first (and only) 'Bishop of New Zealand.' Consecrated under letters patent from Queen Victoria in 1841, his independent spirit was shown from the very beginning. A clause in his letters patent professed to 'give him power to ordain.' To this he immediately objected, saying, 'I conceive that those functions which are merely spiritual are conveyed to the bishop by the act of consecration alone.'

This spirit of independence was further shown when, twenty-four years later, he and his suffragans in New Zealand petitioned the Queen to allow them to resign their letters patent in order to create an autonomous, independent Church in the Dominion. By that time Bishop Selwyn had brought into being the bishoprics of Christchurch, Nelson, Waiapu, Wellington, and the missionary diocese of Melanesia. As all these dioceses were formed from what had been his own diocese of New Zealand, his method had been to propose a person whom he considered fit for the bishopric, to obtain the consent of the churchpeople of the district and then to apply for letters patent; but when, in 1859, the General Synod of the Church in New Zealand came into existence, the future election of bishops was delegated to the Synods of the different dioceses.

Bishop Selwyn was, if not the originator, at any rate a pioneer in the form of Church government which is now the norm in most, if not all, of the overseas provinces of the

Anglican Communion. From the first beginnings of his work of organising the English Church in New Zealand, he determined that the laity should have a full share in the affairs of the Church, and it is owing to his direction that the episcopate in New Zealand is essentially 'constitutional' if not 'democratic.' Each of the seven dioceses now existing in New Zealand is under the governance of its Synod, in which the laity are represented as fully as the clergy. Every canon or resolution of the Synod has to be passed in both 'houses,' which sit together, and has also to receive the assent of the bishop of the diocese. The bishop thus retains the power of veto, but it is a power which he shares with the clergy and the laity alike. In all ecclesiastical courts the laity are represented, and, indeed, one may say that in all ecclesiastical matters, from the formation of a new parish to the appointment of a parish priest, the laity have as much say as the bishop or clergy.

The government of the Church of the province is by means of the General Synod, which meets every three years, in which the bishops of the province sit by right of office and the clerical and lay members are elected for each separate session. As the Church in New Zealand is not established, the power of control is 'contractual'; that is to say, every bishop and every priest and deacon has to make a declaration of assent to the General Synod's regulations as a condition of holding office of any kind in the Church.

The bishops are elected by the Synods of their respective dioceses and the archbishop is elected by the General Synod. In each case the different 'houses' vote separately and each, or, in the case of the archbishop, all three houses have to agree.

The election is confirmed by the General Synod, or, if the General Synod be not in session, by the majority of the standing committees of the several dioceses.

In 1865 occurred an event which serves to illustrate alike the powers inherent in the Diocesan Synods of New Zealand and also the spirit of independence of outside control that has marked the Church in New Zealand from its earliest days.

The diocese of Christchurch had grown beyond the powers of a single bishop, and it was decided to create a new diocese to include the southern part of the country and to have its see town at Dunedin.

The procedure for the formation of a new diocese in the Dominion is that the primate summons an elected 'Convention' of representatives of the clergy and laity of the district, who elect their new bishop and form *ex officio* his first Synod, so that one might almost say that the Synod comes into existence before the bishop does so.

Bishop Selwyn would seem to have forgotten that circumstances had changed and that the new diocese was not part of his own diocese, which was now that which is to-day known as the diocese of Auckland, and, as he personally knew of no one whom he considered suitable for the post, he wrote to the then Archbishop of Canterbury asking him to choose and consecrate a bishop. Archbishop Longley did so, consecrating his nominee as 'a bishop for work in New Zealand' but not naming the see.

The newly consecrated bishop, shortly before he left England, took part in a service at what was then considered one of the very 'advanced' churches in England. Whether this was the real reason for what followed it is impossible to say, but on the plea that he was too 'high church' the Convention of Dunedin refused to elect him to the bishopric and proceeded to elect another priest in his place. In the end the first candidate retired, returned to England and lived there quietly till his death, and his 'rival' was duly consecrated, though for some years the question as to whether he was the first or the second Bishop of Dunedin was hotly discussed.

The incident is of importance in that it led to the passing of a canon to the effect that any priest elected as a bishop for New Zealand must be consecrated in the province, thus further emphasising its independence as an autonomous whole.

As the Diocesan Synod is the legislative authority for the diocese, so is the General Synod the supreme authority for the province and, it would almost seem, the supreme source of all authority in the Church of New Zealand. So much so is this the case that the question has actually been raised whether, in a case where no Synod at present exists, as for example might happen in a missionary diocese, the bishop of that diocese has or has not the power to summon or constitute a Synod unless or until he has been authorised to do so by the General Synod of the province.

In this connection it is worth while noting that, legally, the General Synod has the power to pass regulations affecting any single diocese quite irrespective of the wishes of the bishop or the Synod of that diocese. It is certainly extremely unlikely that General Synod would act in so high-handed a manner, but the fact remains that it has this power should it desire to exercise it. Thus canons and regulations of a General Synod are binding on all the separate dioceses without any reference of such regulations back to the Diocesan Synods. The only exception to this is that decisions of General Synod are only binding on the associated missionary dioceses in so far as they are applicable ; but here again General Synod is itself the Court of Appeal should the question arise as to what is and what is not applicable to a missionary diocese.

The mention of associated missionary dioceses calls for some remark. By an early canon of General Synod any missionary diocese may apply to General Synod for ‘ association ’ with the province of New Zealand.

Should the General Synod approve, then this diocese becomes an ‘ associated ’ missionary diocese and the bishop has a seat in the General Synod, in the House of Bishops, with an equal position and vote with the bishops of the province, and he has the right to nominate two clerical and two lay members of General Synod. There are now two such associated dioceses, Polynesia and Melanesia. When the canon was passed there was only one such possible diocese, Melanesia, and that was very small ; its bishop might often be unable to be present at the Synod, and the presence of clergy or laity from the diocese was still less likely. Hence arose the fact that the clerical and lay representatives of an associated diocese need not be actually from such a diocese, but may be, and frequently have been, residents in New Zealand.

In the early days of this arrangement no one thought of questioning the position or asking what was the actual position of an associated diocese and its bishop. Now the question has arisen and it is difficult to decide. Is a bishop of such a diocese a bishop of the province of New Zealand? Is he eligible for election as archbishop? If not, what exactly is his position? All these questions will have to be decided before very long, for the possibilities of the position are curious. Even to-day the votes of two bishops out of the nine (seven in New Zealand and two associated) who form the House of Bishops are of value and may be decisive in a matter that only concerns the internal affairs of the Church in New Zealand, while the possibility (and if not a *probability* it *is* a possibility) of four extra votes in each of the two houses of clergy and laity all being drawn from the same diocese in New Zealand would entirely upset the representative proportions of General Synod. Again, it is within the bounds of possibility that before very long the diocese of Melanesia may be divided into three separate dioceses, all of which may be 'associated,' and then a possible solid block of four votes in the House of Bishops and sixteen in the other two houses may easily prove a source of anxiety. For example, with the growth of 'parliamentary' government in the Church of the province may easily come the growth of 'parliamentary' tactics, and then two recalcitrant New Zealand bishops, with the help of the four associated bishops, might prevent the passage of some measure that the rest of the bishops and the whole of the other two houses might feel was of the utmost importance for the welfare of the Church in New Zealand, while, with the aid of the sixteen nominated representatives in the two 'lower' houses, some measure, undesired by many of the actual New Zealand members, might possibly be forced through the three houses.

Even to-day the votes of the two bishops of the associated dioceses, which have the same value in a division as those of the bishops of dioceses in the Dominion, are of some importance and, in a close division, might be decisive in a matter that only concerned the internal affairs of the Church in New Zealand; while the fact that the bishops of the associated dioceses might nominate, as their representative members, persons all resident in one New Zealand diocese makes it possible for that diocese to supply fourteen members to General Synod as against the normal six members supplied by each of the other dioceses ; a position never contemplated by the canons, which are careful to provide for equal representation of all the New Zealand dioceses. This is a state of affairs which, while strictly in accordance with the letter of the canons, is entirely contrary to their spirit and intention.

The system has, of course, great advantages. It provides a constitutional means for the expression of the views and wishes of clergy and laity alike ; it is a safeguard against undue and undesirable autocratic action on the part of any individual bishop or excessive influence of any party in the Church, and, whereas it compels the laity to take a full share in the business and especially the financial business of the Church, it should leave the bishops freer to devote their entire time and energies to the spiritual side of their work. On the other hand, there is the danger that the Synods and boards set up under synodal authority may usurp too great a control of affairs and tend to reduce the episcopate to a position akin to that of chairmen of committees, and it would seem to make it possible for a small body of malcontents to exercise an unnatural influence in opposition to a bishop in what he conceives to be desirable for his diocese, and, generally, to interfere in Church affairs to an extent that might do very real harm to Church life and work.

IV

(xi) THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION: THE CHURCH OF THE PROVINCE OF SOUTH AFRICA

By F. R. Phelps, Bishop of Grahamstown

In the appeal of the Lambeth Conference for reunion, it was said: 'We greatly desire that the office of a Bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, and more truly express all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian family in the title of Father in God.'

The history of the Anglican Episcopate in South Africa is the history of the change from an Erastian Prelacy to Constitutional Episcopacy. The change has been brought about through a series of events, some of them the result of an altered system of Civil Government and Law, and some of them through Ecclesiastical controversies. These latter were in themselves deplorable and distressing; yet, through the benediction of God and the overruling of the Spirit, they were stages in the process by which the Church of the Province of South Africa attained to that constitutional system of Episcopacy and spiritual freedom which happily prevails to-day.

When Lord Charles Somerset was made Governor of Cape Colony, in 1814, he was appointed among other offices to that of 'Ordinary.' An Ordinary is properly an Official of the Church who has authority under virtue of his office, and not as a delegate. Applied to the Governors of Cape Colony the term was interpreted to give an almost complete control of the Church until the Diocesan Organisation was set up in 1847, and even afterwards. The Church in the colonies had laboured under a hopeless disadvantage in having no bishops. This was not because people were blind to that disadvantage; from Charles I's time efforts were repeatedly made to provide bishops for settlements overseas; but every attempt failed. The Colonial Church had to do as best it could under the oversight of the Bishop of London.

It was not until near the end of the eighteenth century that bishops were consecrated for the United States of America and for Canada. Further progress was made by the appointment of the first Bishop of Calcutta in 1814. Other Indian and Australian sees were then created; and the only confirmations and episcopal services performed in South Africa were by bishops of these dioceses calling at the Cape in the course of their voyages.[1] In 1827 Bishop James of Calcutta called at the Cape; two years later his successor, Bishop Turner, stayed ten days in Cape Town; and in 1832 Bishop Daniel Wilson of Calcutta consecrated sites for churches at Rondebosch and Wynburg. These bishops confirmed considerable numbers of people and held a few ordinations.

The next bishop to visit South Africa was Dr. Corrie of Madras in 1835; and in 1843 Bishop Nixon of Tasmania called at the Cape and confirmed some hundreds of candidates, and ordained one priest. But still South Africa had no bishops of its own.

It was in 1841 that the Colonial Bishoprics' Fund was established under Archbishop Howley, and steps were taken to establish a Bishopric at Cape Town; but it was not until more than five years later, in 1847, that Robert Gray was chosen to that office. He was the seventh son of Robert Gray, Bishop of Bristol, and had been vicar of Stockton-on-Tees and Hon. Canon of Durham.

At the time of Bishop Gray's appointment there were a few Government chaplains at the Cape, paid and appointed by the civil authority. These chaplains exercised their ministry only in centres where colonists and imperial troops were in sufficient numbers to require them; and the spiritual needs of scattered settlers and traders could hardly be said to be provided for. Communications were difficult;

---

[1] Charles Gould, *Grahamstown Cathedral.*

only gradually were white men penetrating farther and farther from the coast, and the native people were a continual menace to those who had invaded their territories. The main population of English descent lay in Cape Town, along the coast near Port Elizabeth, where the 1820 settlers had been landed, at Grahamstown, and at Graaff Reinet where there were a few English Church people settled.

The only person whose business it was to care for the Church and her welfare, as has been said, was the Governor of the Cape, and if he did nothing in this direction nothing was done. There were no bishops to see to the organisation and expansion of the Church, and, as a whole, Church life was at a desperately low ebb. But the missionary life of the Church was stirring in various ways and gradually provision was being made for ecclesiastical organisation overseas.

Under the theory of the lawyers of the time, the Dominions overseas were looked on as under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London, which was naturally purely nominal. When Bishop Gray was called to the episcopate, he was appointed Bishop of Cape Town under Royal Letters Patent, making him in reality a bishop of the Church of England, though exercising his jurisdiction overseas. The Letters Patent gave him such authority as was possessed by a bishop in England, and he was charged with the general supervision of all Church people throughout the whole of South Africa. The record of his episcopate is one of noble efforts to care for these, his children. In the sub-continent his journeys are bywords for splendid tenacity and courage ; he was the first white man, so it is said, to take a wagon with horses from the Cape to the Eastern Province and Natal ; and the difficulties involved and the hardships he experienced stand out as comparable with those endured by Christian pioneers in all lands. He at once saw clearly that, owing to the immense distances to be covered, and the difficulties of communications, an increase of the episcopate was urgent, if the work of the Church among the English inhabitants and the unevangelised native people of South Africa was to be in any degree adequately performed. He decided that Grahamstown and Natal should each have a bishop of its own. In order that this might be brought to pass he surrendered his Letters Patent as bishop of the whole of South Africa, and received new Letters purporting to appoint him Bishop of Cape Town and Metropolitan, with visitatorial powers over the two new dioceses, though still himself subject to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The bishops chosen for Grahamstown and Natal received Letters Patent for their respective dioceses.

But here lay the roots of that constitutional struggle which was at length to issue in the freeing of the English Church in South Africa from the legal trammels of 'the establishment' as understood in the Mother Church. The story is long and painful. It may be read in detail in Dr. Wirgman's 'Life of Dean Green' and 'History of the English Church in South Africa,' and in Dr. Hamilton Baynes' 'South Africa,' in the handbooks of English Church Expansion. It will suffice here to give only a summary.

In 1861 Bishop Gray issued a summons for the holding of a Diocesan Synod, which one of his clergy, the Rev. W. Long, Vicar of Mowbray, refused to publish. The result was his trial in the Bishop's Court for disobedience, and his deprivation. He appealed to the Supreme Court of the Colony, which ruled that Bishop Gray's second Royal Letters Patent, having been issued after the Grant of a Constitution to the Cape Colony, were invalid, and powerless to convey coercive jurisdiction of any kind. The court found, however, that Long had contracted himself personally to his bishop by ordination and his oath of canonical obedience, and that the bishop had, in fact, the right to issue a summons to Synod. Long appealed to the Privy Council, which, under the presidency of Lord Westbury (the Sir Richard Bethell who as Solicitor-General had himself issued the Bishop's Patent), found that the second Letters Patent were invalid, and that the Crown had no right to constitute a Bishopric of Cape Town. The Privy Council maintained, moreover, that since the summoning of Synods had been discontinued in England, Bishop Gray had no right to require his clergy to attend in South Africa.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* Agar Hamilton, *A Transvaal Jubilee.*

While Long's case was still before the Privy Council a fresh complication arose. Bishop Colenso of Natal was presented to the Metropolitan for trial by certain of his clergy who charged him with heretical teaching. Bishop Gray was most anxious to avoid proceeding against one with whom he had been on terms of considerable intimacy, but in the end he was forced to take action. The case was tried in St. George's Cathedral, Capetown. Colenso declined to appear; and the Metropolitan, acting with the other bishops of the Province, pronounced him excommunicate.

Again an appeal was taken to the Privy Council, which decided as it had done shortly before in the case of Long *v.* The Bishop of Cape Town, that Bishop Gray's Letters Patent were invalid: that Colenso's Oath of Obedience had been taken under a misapprehension: and that the sentence of the Ecclesiastical Court of Cape Town was null and void. The result of these two decisions was to destroy the whole basis of the Royal Supremacy upon which the Crown lawyers had attempted to build up a Colonial 'Establishment.' But at the same time Lord Westbury indicated the lawyers' line of retreat: 'The Church of England,' he said, 'in places where there is no Church established by Law, is in the same position as any other religious body, in no better but in no worse position, and the members may adopt rules for enforcing discipline within their body.' It was clear, therefore, that the organisation of the Church had now to be constituted on a purely voluntary basis, and in 1870 a Provincial Synod met and drew up a Constitution for the Church, under the designation of 'the Church of the Province of South Africa.' Some doubt and opposition was felt at this new departure, as it seemed; but Bishop Gray's wisdom and foresight prevailed, and the Constitution under which the Church does its work to-day is his creation.

At a second Provincial Synod in 1876, the Constitution was confirmed and has remained to this day. But it was not long before the great Bishop's call came. In 1872 he died from a fall from his horse; and the final passing of the Constitution was left to his successor, William West Jones.

Bishop Gray's Consecration. It is interesting to note that the Church of the Province of South Africa, together with other Churches of the Dominions, has inherited from the Mother Church in England the true Apostolic Succession of the Catholic Church through three distinct lines of bishops, English, Irish and Italian. Robert Gray, the first Bishop of Cape Town, was consecrated in 1847 by the Archbishop of Canterbury and eight other bishops, and thus received consecration in the direct line from Archbishop Laud.

But Dr. Gray's inheritance of the Apostolic Succession does not depend merely on three single and separate lines received from three national Churches. The Apostolic Succession of bishops may be compared rather to a net than to a series of isolated chains.

By ancient rule each bishop must have at least three consecrators, though one consecrator is actually sufficient to ensure valid consecration. Thus, each of Dr. Gray's nine consecrators was himself consecrated by three or in six cases by no less than four bishops. Among these thirty-three, deducting names that recur, there are fifteen new names representing fifteen lines of spiritual ancestry, and every step higher would show an ever-increasing number, like the meshes of the net to which it has been compared.

The Title of Archbishop. Here it may be convenient to make mention of the assumption by the Metropolitan of the title Archbishop. The subject had been mooted in the Provincial Synod of 1870, and a formal resolution was passed in the Synod of 1891 asking that it might be adopted. But the Metropolitan decided to wait until the Lambeth Conference of 1897. This conference approved of the title being assumed by Metropolitans of provinces overseas, and after a formal request from the Synod of bishops, the Metropolitan on July 28 decided to adopt and use the name and title of Archbishop.

The Election of a Bishop. The election of bishops in the Church of the Province is carried out under regulations laid down in the Canons. Upon this rests the constitutional authority which the bishops of the Church of the Province possess.

The Canons lay down that in a diocese where there are not less than six priests the bishop shall be chosen by an elective assembly. This assembly consists of all the licensed priests in the diocese, together with representatives of the laity, meeting under a mandate issued by the archbishop. The deacons, if not fewer than three, give a corporate vote through one of their number. There are variations in minor regulations that obtain in different dioceses, but the main rules are the same for all. When a see becomes vacant and the archbishop's mandate has been received, adequate time is allowed for the issue of summons by the dean or senior priest of the vacant diocese to the clergy to attend the elective assembly, and to hold meetings in which lay representatives may be chosen.

The elective assembly sits under the presidency of the dean or senior priest, and either elects a person by name for the office or delegates the choice to the archbishop of the province and others with him. The assembly may also express its desire that a bishop should be chosen from England, in which case the archbishop shall consult with the Archbishop of Canterbury. Persons are nominated and seconded in the elective assembly by priests of the diocese, and, after discussion by the assembly, voting takes place. When any name has received the votes of at least two-thirds of the number of priests present, that name is referred to the lay representatives for their acceptance or rejection. In most dioceses a two-thirds majority in the House of the laity is required for acceptance ; in some only a majority.

In order to facilitate the work of the elective assembly, some dioceses have instituted an advisory board, elected by the Synod of the diocese, which shall meet as soon as possible, after the see becomes vacant, to consider nominees that may be proposed in the assembly. Doubt has been expressed as to whether this procedure does not interfere with the free action of the elective assembly under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. But it is becoming generally recognised that some degree of inquiry and discussion before an election is necessary, in order that the members may bring to the assembly minds as fully equipped with information as may be upon which the Holy Spirit may exercise His divine guidance and direction as promised to the Church. The rights and freedom of the elective assembly are in no way infringed ; for any priest may nominate any candidate even though the name has not been placed before the assembly by the advisory board, and it is of undoubted value that a board, acting under the authority and within the cognisance of the diocese as a whole, should take the place of unauthorised and sectional meetings for preliminary discussion.

When a bishop has been elected, his name is presented to the Metropolitan, and a court of confirmation is held, wherein the bishops of the Province or their commissaries sit, in order that examination may be made as to whether there is any canonical bar to his consecration. If the court of confirmation confirms the election, in due course the bishop-elect is consecrated by the Metropolitan and his comprovincials and is enthroned in his cathedral church by the senior priest of the diocese.

Thus the new bishop comes to his diocese with a knowledge that he has been chosen to his office by the majority of the priests and representatives of the laity ; and he begins his ministry as bishop with the encouragement that such knowledge gives him. It is, indeed, one of the peculiar joys of the episcopate in South Africa that the relations between the bishop thus elected and his clergy and people are grounded on such an intimate spiritual experience of the Divine Guidance and Will. Even though he may be personally unknown to the majority of his flock he is, in very truth, their Father in God. And if he has been, in the past, one of the clergy of the diocese, he is strengthened and supported, as he rules over his former brethren, by the consciousness that the brotherly relation still persists even though the fatherly has been superadded to it.

This is but the basis of a still more intimate and personal knowledge that the bishop has of his priests and people. The area covered by the diocese may be large (*e.g.* the area of the Diocese of Cape Town is larger than England, of Southern Rhodesia three times, of Kimberley and Kuruman nearly seven times as great) ; the members of the Church therein comparatively few ; but spiritual bonds transcend all worldly measurement, and the constitutional method of the bishop's election, together with his personal knowledge of and touch with his people, enables the diocese to realise its place as a self-conscious unit in the Body of Christ. The Catholic conception of the episcopate proves itself to-day, as all down the history of the Church, to be of the essence of her life.

The Bishop and the Episcopal Synod. On election the bishop is brought into the society of a band of brothers who form the Episcopal Synod of the Province under the presidency of the Archbishop and Metropolitan. The bishops of the Province meet in Episcopal Synod every year in order to discuss the intimate details of the Church's work and organisation, and to take counsel together for the well-being of the flock committed to them. Though naturally each bishop brings with him a varying outlook on matters of detail, and each has in his own diocese special characteristics of work to consider, nevertheless it is possible to attain a marked measure of united policy and action which is of the utmost value.

The Church of the Province is small in comparison with the great Dutch Reformed Church of the country, for the Dutch-speaking inhabitants number more than half the European population of the Union. Yet, by its united action, it has been able to exercise a real influence on the general thought and policy of South Africa. When, in 1927, certain Bills were before the Legislature dealing with the status and rights of the natives of the country, the bishops put out a memorandum in which the civil rights of the Bantu people were defended. Equality of all men, white or black, regardless of education and standards of civilisation was not claimed; but the moral rights and civic liberty of all citizens of the country were stressed. And though this memorandum on the colour-bar question was in some quarters greatly resented, it contributed not a little to the withdrawal of the Bills for further consideration; and the native people were assured that in the bishops they had had champions of their just cause.

But in the Episcopal Synod matters of more domestic concern are usually dealt with.

Among the subjects which have engaged the attention of the bishops in their Synod, one of the chief is Prayer Book revision. For years past the work has been going on. The service for the Holy Communion was first revised, and, after being submitted for experimental use and criticism by the clergy and laity, has been issued in final form, and has gained the general approval of liturgical scholars. The revision of the Occasional Offices and of the Calendar is now being advanced a stage, and it is hoped that before many years the Church of the Province will have her own Prayer Book, not in complete substitution for the Book of Common Prayer, but adapted to the special conditions which obtain.

But other matters have presented themselves to be dealt with. It will suffice to mention but a few. Marriage questions ; polygamy, and a Guild of Polygamists, who are not for one reason or another able to accept the Christian conception of marriage and so are debarred from Holy Baptism ; social welfare, both for Europeans and natives ; and the training of ordinands in theological subjects, and of European missionaries in Bantu languages, ethnology and psychology. A Faculty of Divinity has been established which conducts examinations and grants diplomas of studentship and associateship in theology. It must be remembered that the Episcopal Synod is not a legislative body (for the making of Canons for the Church of the Province belongs exclusively to the Provincial Synod), but rather ensures a large measure of unity in administration which serves to bind the fourteen dioceses of the Province into a common corporate life.

In 1900 the bishops of the Province were approached by a body of native Christians who had become anxious to be admitted to a share in the corporate life of the Church, and to receive the valid orders which the Catholic Church alone can give. These native Christians had been members of the Wesleyan Society and of other Protestant sects, and had at first allied themselves to the American Methodist Episcopal Church. Their leader was James Mata Dwâné, who had been ordained as Vicar-Bishop in 1896. But in 1900, Mr. Dwâné and the conference of ‘ the Ethiopian Church ’ (as it was called) became assured that his orders were invalid. They, therefore, petitioned the archbishop and bishops to give them valid orders, and to make such arrangements as might be found possible to include their society as an entity within the fold of the Catholic Church. The conference further formally accepted and embraced the doctrine, sacraments and discipline of Christ as the same are contained and commanded in Holy Scripture according as the Church of England has set forth the same in its standards of faith and doctrine. After much prayer and deliberation the bishops agreed to this request. Mr. Dwâné and the leaders of the movement were solemnly received into the Fellowship of the Church and were confirmed, and the society was constituted under the name of 'The Order of Ethiopia.' The Order is external to the parochial and missionary organisation of the Church, but is under the authority of the bishops of those dioceses in which its missions lie. It is governed by a Provincial and a Chapter consisting of twelve members, six appointed by the Visitor, who is the Archbishop, and six by the Provincial. The Order, in spite of many difficulties, has increased in numbers, many candidates being confirmed each year, and raises the necessary money for its work without help from outside; and it is the hope and prayer of the Church that it will be, in increasing measure, an instrument whereby the Gospel may be brought to the native people of the country.

The Bishop and the Provincial Synod. The Provincial Synod, in which the bishops of the Province sit as one of the three 'Houses,' meets every five years, and is the Legislative Body of the Church of the Province of South Africa.

The primary work of the Provincial Synod is the amendment and passing of Canons; but the Synod also has the right, in the interests of unity in administration, of reviewing all Acts of Diocesan Synods, and no such Act has any force in any diocese of the Province if it is in conflict with any enactment of the Provincial Synod.

The Provincial Synod consists of three Houses—the bishops of the Province, the clergy, the laity—with the Archbishop as president *ex officio*. The two latter Houses are composed of representatives of the clergy elected by the clergy in each diocese in the proportion of one clergyman to every ten licensed priests, and an equal number of laymen elected by the lay members of the Diocesan Synods.

Ordinarily the Synod sits and votes as one body; but provision is made for deliberation and voting by orders; the House of the laity voting first, then that of the clergy, and lastly that of the bishops. This secures that no resolution dealing with matters of Faith and Order can pass without the consent of the House of Bishops.

Each ecclesiastic, be he bishop, priest or deacon, before being admitted to any office or cure, is required to make a declaration accepting the binding force of the rules and regulations made by the Synod of the Province; and he further acknowledges the tribunals set up by the Synod, promising to submit to any sentence therein pronounced, saving all rights of appeal allowed by the said Provincial Synod. It is thus that the Church of the Province has incorporated into its constitution the course suggested by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of Long *v.* The Bishop of Cape Town (see above). The disciplinary and legislative freedom of the Church of the Province of South Africa rests on the principle of free contract, and any appeal from the Provincial Court only lies to the Judicial Committee on the question whether the contract exists, and whether its provisions have been duly carried out. No question as to the facts of the case can be raised in the secular court.

Provision is made under the Canons that, should a spiritual tribunal be constituted for the whole Anglican Communion, an appeal from the Provincial Court on a question of Faith or Doctrine may be carried to such tribunal. In the meanwhile the Consultative Body, constituted in pursuance of Resolution 5 of the Lambeth Conference of 1897, may be applied to in an advisory capacity to the Final Court of the Province.

The authority to make such adaptations and abridgements of, and additions to, the services of the Church as may be required by the circumstances of the Province lies with the Provincial Synod, and the bishops are limited in the exercise of their *jus liturgicum* by this authority.

Nevertheless, a large measure of freedom is allowed in the conduct of public worship, but always in agreement with the authorised standards of the Church.

It is interesting to note that, just as in England Ecclesiastical Unity existed before the State became one, so in South Africa the Church had her one Provincial Synod forty years before the Union of South Africa was attained. Indeed, the area covered by the Church of the Province is greater than that of the Union of South Africa, for Southern Rhodesia is a Diocese of the Province, and so are the Diocese of Lebombo, lying in Portuguese East Africa, and the Diocese of Damaraland, comprising what was German South-West Africa, now administered by the Union Government under a mandate from the League of Nations.

The Bishop and his Diocesan Synod. In origin the Diocesan Synod consisted of the bishop and his presbyters. The bishop's authority was inherent in his office, but in the interests of the well-being of his diocese he needed to be in possession of the opinion of his clergy. By the Constitution and Canons of the Church of the Province of South Africa, the Diocesan Synod is enlarged by the inclusion of the laity. This is recognised as not only wise but necessary ; for the Church of the Province is a voluntary body, and the laity therefore are intimately concerned in dealing with those matters of finance which depend so greatly upon their goodwill and co-operation.

All the priests licensed in the diocese have the right of a seat in the Diocesan Synod. The House of the laity is chosen by the communicants of the diocese according to certain rules laid down. The deacons are allowed to sit and speak, but not to vote.

Quoting from the report of the Lambeth Committees of 1867, the Constitution reads : 'The Provincial Synod should deal with questions of common interest to the Province and with those that affect the communion of the dioceses with one another, and with the rest of the Church ; whilst the Diocesan Synod should be left free to dispose of matters of local interest, and to manage the affairs of the diocese.' Accordingly, when the Bishop in Synod has behind him the considered opinion of the clergy and laity of his diocese, the strength of his position can hardly be exaggerated. It enables him to address his people, knowing that he is speaking not simply for himself, but for the whole diocese as represented in Synod; and his appeals or directions gain thereby in moral weight.

But the bishop's authority is not abrogated as he sits in his Diocesan Synod. He still has the right of veto on any resolution proposed. But an appeal lies to the Episcopal Synod from such veto, if both houses of clergy and laity are in opposition; and if that Synod disallows the bishop's veto he is then bound to promulgate the resolution. No instance of such an occurrence is known to the present writer, but the provision is made in order that the rightful authority of the bishop may be constitutionally limited and autocracy be avoided.

But the value of a Diocesan Synod is not confined to the formal decisions relating to diocesan organisation. It is of a far deeper and spiritual nature. The clergy in this vast country are much isolated in their lonely cures, and seldom have the opportunity of meeting their brethren. The fellowship and brotherhood which result from their contact with one another, and the sense of a common cause and a common task are an encouragement and strength; and the privilege of taking part in the corporate worship of the Synod services is an inspiration and memory which they take back with them to their parishes and people. Many a Synodsman has gained a new vision of the Church Catholic through taking part in the deliberations, and sharing in Communion, with his fellow members in the Synod of the Diocese.

The Bishop and his Clergy. The relation of the bishop to his clergy in a diocese of the Province is one of close fellowship, as has already been pointed out. Perhaps the chief duty, or one of the chief duties, of the bishop is to administer patronage in his diocese, and to secure such movement of his clergy from one cure to another as will avoid stagnation. It is recognised by the rules and regulations of the various dioceses that the right of patronage rests with the bishop of the diocese. But in those dioceses where institution to a benefice obtains the bishop's freedom of action is limited, both by the freehold of the clergy, and also by the right of veto which the parishioners possess. Where the clergy are not instituted, but hold their cure under licence from the bishop, his freedom is greater. But for all that, limitations there must be. Questions of health and age have necessarily to be considered; and, inasmuch as the Church in South Africa depends not upon endowments but on voluntary support, the laity of a parish will always have an important voice in the appointment of the priest who is to minister to them.

Before admission to his office as incumbent of a parish or as priest in charge of a mission, a priest is required to take the oath of canonical obedience to his bishop, and also to sign declarations of acceptance of the formulas of the Church and of the rules and regulations made by the Provincial or the Diocesan Synod. This establishes in every case the fact that the Church is a voluntary association, and the discipline of the Church rests upon the foundation that the clergy have all bound themselves by these undertakings of obedience to the Constitution and Canons.

In most cases the parishes voluntarily raise the stipend necessary for the priest and for the maintenance of the parish church and usually either provide transport or give a grant towards its expense. In some dioceses of the Province the centralising of funds for stipends has been brought about, and thereby the stipends of the clergy are equalised, and calculated upon the length of service and the existence of any dependent upon the priest concerned. In either case the responsibility for the raising of the necessary funds lies upon the laity of the Church; and, considering the fact that the Church of the Province only numbers a proportion of less than half of the white population of South Africa, they accomplish their work well.

In the missions of the Province to native and coloured people, the European clergy are mainly paid from the grants received from societies overseas, such as S.P.G. and the home associations of the various dioceses; and the native clergy are paid almost entirely from the contributions made by the native people towards the support of their ministers. Diocesan central funds, and the small endowments which some dioceses possess, subsidise to some extent the local funds of the parishes and missions.

Not only is the bishop responsible for the exercise of patronage, but it is his concern to provide for the supply of clergy for his diocese. For this he has to find candidates and arrange for their training. European candidates, in training for Orders in the Church of the Province, generally are sent to St. Paul's College, Grahamstown, which is not a diocesan but the Provincial Theological College. There they receive two, three, or four years' training for the ministry; and, when desirable, it is also possible for them to attend lectures at the Rhodes University College, one of the constituent colleges of the University of South Africa, and to take a degree before their ordination.

For the native ordinands, several of the dioceses have colleges of their own. It is necessary to train the native clergy locally because the language question makes any one college impossible. Each diocese, generally speaking, has to deal with the language or languages current among natives of that part, and therefore local training is essential.

Although the number of candidates for Holy Orders is increasing in the Church of the Province, it is only increasing at a very slow rate, and for the work that has to be accomplished there must always be, for years to come, a demand for European priests from the Mother Church. It is also desirable, and in some cases has been accomplished, that men trained for work in South Africa should go to England for the experience of two or three years' work in some large, well-ordered parish. Considering the comparative smallness of most of the parishes in South Africa, so far as Church population is concerned, this is of the greatest value, for it gives men an insight into the larger and fuller Church life where the population is so much greater.

But throughout the Church of the Province the expansion of the Church's work is largely dependent upon the money that can be raised locally or in England, and it is a sore trial to the bishop when large areas of people, European or native, have to be left unshepherded through lack of funds to pay a priest. Not only have the European parishes to support their own clergy, but they are called upon, and respond bravely, to help in the provision of Church privileges for the native people who are less fortunately situated than themselves. Further, it should be said that considering the average rate of pay which a native man earns, he gives generously to the support of his own native clergy.

The Bishop and the Laity. As has been considered above, the system of the Church, and the fact that the laity have to provide the stipends of their clergy, limit to some extent the freedom with which the bishop can appoint priests to cures, and has sometimes been thought to be a weakness of the voluntary system. Nevertheless, the relation of the bishop to his laity, in a diocese of the Church of the Province, is one of very close friendship and understanding. The fact of the comparative fewness of the cures, large though the areas be, enables the bishop not only to know his clergy intimately, but also to know most of the leading laity as well ; and though sometimes there may be a difficulty in arriving at a *modus vivendi* in matters of appointment or the like, the gains that are the result far outweigh the difficulties. There is certainly on the part of the laity a much greater understanding of their place in the Church, and of their duties to her. The fact that representatives of the laity sit in the Diocesan Synods, and also in the Provincial Synod, where the Canons of the Church are made, makes the laity feel that they are vitally concerned in the welfare of the Church's life, to an extent that is not possible for a layman in England ; and the Church of the Province owes an incalculable debt of gratitude for the loyal support and help which so many of her lay men and women render to her in all kinds of ways.

A movement is on foot to enlarge the representation of the laity by the inclusion of women communicants in the privileges of election to various offices in the Church. Until now, by the Canons, participation in such offices as churchwarden, electors for representatives to Synods, etc., is limited to male communicants ; but if proposals which have been brought into Provincial Synod go forward to completion, communicants of both sexes will be equally eligible. But whether this be so or not, the Church of the Province has cause for deep thankfulness for the local co-operation which the laity, both men and women, give to their bishops and clergy in maintaining and extending the Kingdom of Christ in South Africa.

Conclusion. The Church of the Province of South Africa, otherwise known as the Church of England, or the English Church or Church of the Anglican Communion in these parts (to quote its official title), has had an organised life of less than a hundred years, and has had to endure, as has been seen, the trials and difficulties which test the reality of Faith. Robert Gray landed from England on February 20, 1848, the only bishop of the English Church in South Africa. His charge was a diocese of enormous and vaguely defined area. He found a handful of persons belonging to the Church, even in Cape Colony; still fewer in Natal; practically none outside the two colonies. The warlike and uncivilised Bantu tribes were still untouched by the English Church, though Wesleyan missionaries were already engaged in their noble work.

Bishop Gray faced the task with a courage and vision which has earned for him the undying reverence of the Church. His life is wrought into the history of the Church of this Province. He was the means by which English Churchmen in South Africa to-day enjoy an ordered polity and guarded freedom. He saw, as in a vision, all South Africa covered by dioceses. He lived to see a marvellous growth towards this ideal. Since his death the vision has been realised. To recount the extension of the Kingdom is not to boast. Rather it is to praise God for blessings granted to His Church, and to be established in the knowledge that the Apostolic ministry is of the essence of the Church's life to-day, as it has been all down her history.

There are now fourteen dioceses in the Church of the Province of South Africa.

1. The See of Cape Town, the Mother-see of the Church of the Province, was founded in 1847 when Bishop Gray was consecrated.

2–3. The Sees of Grahamstown and Natal followed in 1853.

4. The Island Diocese of St. Helena, with Ascension and Tristan da Cunha, was founded in 1859.

5. Bloemfontein (formerly the Orange Free State) received its first bishop in 1863.

6. In 1873 the first Bishop of St. John's, Henry Callaway, was consecrated in Edinburgh; and thus a diocese for which the Metropolitan had made preparation was constituted, though he himself did not live to see it. Ever since that date the Episcopal Church of Scotland has given the Diocese of St. John's valuable support as one of its overseas missions.

7. The Diocese of Pretoria was founded in 1878.

8. In 1870 Thomas Edward Wilkinson had been consecrated missionary bishop of Zululand, and the see became a diocese of the Province in 1898.

9. The Diocese of Mashonaland (called Southern Rhodesia since 1915) was founded in 1891.

10. The Diocese of George, formed of portions of the Dioceses of Cape Town and Grahamstown, was founded in 1911. The funds for the establishment of this diocese had been collected by Bishop Gray, but had been devoted to the support of Bishop Macrorie and his successors, until the Church properties of Natal, which had been held by Bishop Colenso, reverted to the Church of the Province.

11. In 1911 also was founded the Diocese of Kimberley and Kuruman, relieving the Diocese of Cape Town of some of its still over-large area. The funds for this see had been chiefly raised by Bishop T. E. Wilkinson.

12. In 1912 the Diocese of Pretoria was divided, and the Diocese of Johannesburg was constituted, formed of the southern part of the original diocese.

In addition to the dioceses above mentioned, missionary extension has been the peculiar care of the Church. Two missionary jurisdictions have been formed outside the area of the Union, and are included in the Provincial organisation.

13. In 1893 the Missionary Bishopric of Lebombo was formed for work in the Portuguese territory in East Africa, north of Zululand and south of the Sabi River.

14. The Missionary Bishopric of Damaraland was

founded in 1924 by the consecration of Nelson Wellesley Fogarty.

These are the dioceses which now form the Church of the Province of South Africa. But this further must be added. Dr. Livingstone, by his exploration and advocacy, had stirred the heart of the Universities of England, and a committee had been formed to carry the Gospel into Central Africa. Bishop Gray had eagerly supported the idea. In 1861 Charles Frederick Mackenzie had been chosen as Missionary Bishop 'to the tribes on the Zambesi border.' Convocation had recommended that missionary bishops should take the Oath of Canonical Obedience to the nearest Metropolitan. Accordingly, Bishop Mackenzie was consecrated in Cape Town Cathedral by the Metropolitan and the Bishops of Natal and St. Helena, and went forth to his thirteen months' Episcopate with the Apostolic Succession and the blessing of the Church in South Africa. Two years later William George Tozer succeeded him as bishop; and in 1870 the mission was reorganised and recognised as wholly independent of the distant See of Cape Town, and developed into what is now known as the Universities' Mission to Central Africa.

To those now working in the Church of the Province the memory of the past is an incentive and encouragement. We, who have entered into their labours, remember before God with thankfulness the bishops who have gone before us. To name but a few:

Robert Gray, defender of the Church's spiritual liberties against Erastian dominance; 'The Athanasius of the South';

William West Jones, the 'Father in God' who wisely and firmly built upon the foundations laid by his great predecessor;

Henry Cotterill, the lieutenant helping Bishop Gray in the creation of a constitutional system for the Church;

Nathanael James Merriman, the rugged missionary, whose journeys afoot were the wonder of his people;

William Kenneth Macrorie, who patiently lived and laboured for peace, and to restore the breaches in the sorely divided Diocese of Natal ;

Allan Becher Webb, the mystic, revealing the Splendour of God, and the founder of Religious Communities for Women ;

Bransby Lewis Key, the 'Shepherd of the Veld,' the ardent missionary to untaught and uncivilised tribes ;

Thomas William Gaul, the generous and unconventional pioneer, winning hard hearts by zeal and love ;

and many another.

Days of darkness and anxiety have passed. And if other clouds seem to lie on the horizon, the light of God's love and power ever shines for those who are faithful to Him. Much remains for the Church to do. Numbers of new settlers still come to the Union. There are still many lonely and isolated homes to be reached : multitudes of heathen still to be evangelised and built up into the Body of Christ. But the principles of Apostolic Order and Sacramental Life prove valid to-day as they have ever done. And, in this assurance, the Church of the Province, sharing in the corporate life of the whole Catholic Church, must go forward, in the endeavour to bring her children in Africa, in the Unity of the Faith and of the Knowledge of the Son of God, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.

A SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHY

'The Life of Robert Gray.' By his son, Charles Gray. (London, 1876.)

'A Father in God—the Episcopate of William West Jones.' By M. H. M. Wood. Contains a very full bibliography. (London, 1913.)

'The Life of John William Colenso.' By Sir G. W. Cox. (London, 1888.)

'Henry Callaway, First Bishop of Kaffraria.' (London, 1896.)

'Life of James Green, Rector and Dean of Maritzburg.' By A. T. Wirgman. (London, 1909.)

THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION: SOUTH AFRICA

‘Sketches of English Church History in South Africa from 1795 to 1848.’ By J. A. Hewitt. (Cape Town, 1887.)

‘The History of the English Church and People in South Africa.’ By A. T. Wirgman. (1895.)

‘South Africa’ in ‘Mowbray’s Handbooks of English Church Expansion.’ By Bishop Hamilton Baynes. (1908.)

‘Bransby Lewis Key—a Shepherd of the Veld.’ By Godfrey Callaway. (London, 1911.)

‘Grahamstown Cathedral.’ By Charles Gould. (Grahamstown Diocesan Registry, 1924.)

‘A Transvaal Jubilee.’ By J. A. I. Agar-Hamilton. (London, 1928.)

‘Francis Balfour of Basutoland.’ By Bishop H. H. Montgomery. (S.P.G.)

V

EPISCOPACY IN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

By C. A. H. Green, Bishop of Bangor

It is a fundamental doctrine in the Roman Catholic Church that bishops are of Divine institution. They are the successors of the Apostles. Whatever be the authority and power that, by Divine institution also, belong to St. Peter's successor at Rome, they do not and cannot extend so far as to annihilate the Divine rights of the episcopate. Bishops, though dependent on the papacy, 'exist not by mere permission or authority of the Roman Pontiff, but by Divine right and ordination.' Bishops are not the vicars of the Pope. The Supreme Pontiff can divide, unite, suppress, or alter the boundaries of, any diocese whatsoever; but he cannot abolish all the dioceses of Christendom absolutely, in order to rule the Church by his Vicars Apostolic, for such an act would extinguish the Divine right of bishops to exist and to govern their dioceses. Nor could he impose such restrictions upon episcopal jurisdiction as would reduce it almost to nothing. Each bishop rules his diocese in his own name, by his own right, not by mere delegation from the Supreme Pontiff.[1] It is nowadays generally taught that by their consecration all bishops are admitted into a distinctive order, which has its distinctive privileges and power.[1]

---

[1] Cf. *Praelectiones Juris Canonici*, auctore M. Bargilliat, Editio xxxiv, ad canones novi Codicis redactae (Parisiis, 1921), § 594: 'Unde non posset S. Pontifex *omnes* simul totius orbis Christiani Episcopos deponere, et *dioeceses regere per vicarios*, ita ut jam non sint in Ecclesiâ Episcopi qui, tanquam Ordinarii, et proprio nomine, ecclesias regant. Neque posset jurisdictionem Episcoporum per reservationes ita *restringere* ut ad nihilum fere redigatur.'

The Council of Trent declared that the hierarchy of the Catholic Church was instituted by Divine ordinance, and that this hierarchy consists of bishops (episcopi), priests (presbyteri) and deacons (ministri); that bishops are superior to priests; and that if anyone allege that the power which bishops possess is common to them and to priests, 'let him be anathema.' To the opinion of St. Jerome concerning the original equality of bishops and priests no importance is attached: on the contrary, it is to be rejected as inconsistent with the Faith of the Church. By the will of Christ, it is taught, the supreme authority in a diocese does not belong to a college of bishop and priests, but it resides in the single personality of the chief. Episcopacy is monarchical.

Where a Roman Catholic historian, as the result of his studies, concludes that the first Apostles established in many places, as their successors, not an individual bishop, but a 'Collegiate Episcopate,' he is careful to note that even there the monarchical principle has been present from the beginning, in the person of the chief or presiding bishop. Moreover, *ex hypothesi*, every member of such college was a bishop; and the theory lends no support to the main thesis of Presbyterianism. One can easily imagine why the 'Collegiate Episcopate' disappeared, if it ever existed, as soon as bishoprics multiplied, because the presiding bishop found his natural counsellors for the larger questions in the other presiding bishops of the neighbourhood, and for purely domestic purposes his own priests or presbyters formed a sufficient senate. The 'Collegiate Episcopate' was no longer wanted to secure the Apostolic succession on the spot, because for the consecration of a new bishop the bishops of the province were now available. In the actual working of the system thus conceived the presiding bishop was from the start practically the 'diocesan.'

Each diocesan bishop possesses a twofold power, which has descended to him from the Apostles. In the department of the sacred ministry he has the 'Power of Order,' and in the department of spiritual government he has the 'Power of Jurisdiction.' For the sake of clearness we shall treat each separately, although they co-exist necessarily in the person of the bishop.

---

[1] Cf. *Tractatus Canonicus de Sacra Ordinatione*, auctore Petro Gasparri (Parisiis, 1893), § 31.

The bishop obtains his 'Power of Order' through his reception of Episcopal Consecration. Happily there is no dispute on this point. When he is canonically consecrated bishop, the 'Power of Order' is by that act conferred in its fullness upon him. By virtue of the 'Power of Order' a bishop can administer the Sacraments, particularly Confirmation and Ordination—those two Sacraments of which bishops are the ordinary ministers. In this respect all bishops are equal ; not even the Supreme Pontiff has any advantage. Besides the Sacraments, the bishop has power to administer all the 'Sacramentals,' that is, those liturgical rites which have been instituted after the manner of sacraments, but do not confer the grace which they signify on the recipients *ex opere operato* or from the rite performed, yet are of the utmost value for exciting pious and religious dispositions in those who receive them faithfully. Accordingly the holy oils are effective by the bishop's blessing ; he can hallow kings and virgins, consecrate churches and altars, bless abbots—in a word, administer every benediction in which holy oil is applied.

This power, however, as it proceeds from God, who will have all things done decently and in order, may not be used arbitrarily. Its use is limited to the bishop's diocese ; it is not admissible in another diocese except with the consent of the bishop thereof. A bishop is not allowed to bless in any manner that pleases him ; he is obliged to follow the accepted forms. Throughout his entire administration he must conform to the general legislation of the Church and the directions of the Holy See. The question of the limits within which a bishop is at liberty to act is one of jurisdiction. The 'Power of Order' comes to him through episcopal consecration, but the exercise of this right depends on his 'Power of Jurisdiction.'

The second power possessed by a diocesan bishop is the 'Power of Jurisdiction.' Before we inquire how it comes to him, it will be well to learn what exactly it is. The term 'jurisdiction' here means the authority to look after or rule or govern others, within the territory or sphere over which it extends. Jurisdiction has two fields of operation: it ranges partly in the region of public life, partly in that of the individual conscience. In the region of public life it issues commands, makes ecclesiastical laws, decides ecclesiastical cases, and applies ecclesiastical punishments. In the region of the individual conscience it bestows or withholds absolution, and can issue dispensations and remit censures. No sacrament can be administered without some exercise of jurisdiction; it is someone's duty to decide in each case whether and how a sacrament ought to be given. The Church guards the avenues to the sacraments; this watch is part of the cure of souls entrusted to the Minister of Christ. Jurisdiction is coercive in the sense that on its determinations depends the enjoyment or else the loss of spiritual rights and blessings attached to membership in the Catholic Church; it need not involve coercion by physical force which the modern state arrogates to itself. Jurisdiction must be effectual.

This authority to look after or rule or govern others is distributed in varying measure among those who are capable of receiving and of using it. Within narrow limits, the incumbent of every parish [1] has it in his 'cure of souls'; he is placed in charge of his parishioners by virtue of the ecclesiastical laws. It is by a higher right, Divine right, that each bishop has jurisdiction over his diocese; his 'Power of Jurisdiction' is ordinary not delegated, that is to say, it is an essential part of the bishopric as delivered to him, not something added from outside. Consequently it is the right and duty of the bishop to govern his diocese, as well in temporal as in spiritual matters, with legislative, judicial and coercive power, which is to be exercised according to the norm of the Sacred Canons. But his government is limited to his diocese; and within his diocese he is controlled by the Common Law of the Church, from which none but the Supreme Pontiff can dispense. Moreover, the range of his jurisdiction is restricted by the reservation of graver causes and dispensations to the Roman See, which also can exempt persons and places from his rule. The Pope alone has supreme and full ‘ Power of Jurisdiction ’ over the whole Church ; and it is ordinary and immediate over all and singular Churches, and over all and singular pastors and faithful. Yet even this supreme and full power cannot abolish, nor render nugatory, the order of bishops which God has instituted.

---

[1] Parochus.

How far does the jurisdiction of the bishop over the faithful extend to the laity ? By Baptism a man or woman is constituted a person in the Church of Christ, thereby obtaining certain rights and assuming certain obligations. Unless disqualified by some rule, every lay person is by the ecclesiastical law entitled to receive from the clergy spiritual benefits, and all the means necessary for salvation. But membership in the Christian society involves submission to its discipline. By dwelling in a parish the lay person automatically comes under the jurisdiction of the parish priest thereof and its bishop. If lay persons form themselves into associations for a religious purpose, they must obtain the bishop’s approval for the same if they are to be recognised as lawful by the Church. No lay person may join ‘ secret, condemned, seditious or suspect societies, or such as strive to withdraw themselves from the jurisdiction of the Church.’ The bishop can forbid books to members of his diocese ; and he may grant licences to certain persons to read prohibited books. To the bishop the laity look for dispensations or remissions which they need : and when they offend against the Law, Divine or ecclesiastical, the bishop can punish them by depriving them of sacraments and sacramentals, forbidding them to exercise certain ecclesiastical acts, denying them access to their church, or excluding them from Christian burial.

Again, how far do the Religious, in the technical sense of the term, come within the jurisdiction of the bishop, under the present ecclesiastical law? All Religious, exempt or not exempt, those with solemn and those with simple vows, whether they belong to papal or to diocesan institutes, are subject to the Roman Pontiff as their Supreme Superior, whom they are further bound to obey by reason of their vow of obedience. It is held that no religious order or congregation may lawfully exist without the Pope's sanction of their Rule or Constitution. The promise of a Religious to observe the Rule or Constitution, and to obey his local superior, implies submission and obedience to the Supreme Superior on whom the whole discipline ultimately depends. Besides the submission and obedience involved in the vow of obedience, there is the fidelity required of every Catholic to the See of Rome. Subject to what has been said, the Religious are placed also under the jurisdiction of the bishop. The Law declares that the Religious are under the jurisdiction not only of the Pope but also of the Ordinary, except those who have obtained from the Apostolic See the privilege of exemption: and even the exempt are subject to the jurisdiction of the Ordinary in those cases which the ecclesiastical law allows. All members of religious orders, who make solemn vows, are by law exempt. Members of religious congregations, who take simple vows only, are not exempt, unless they have received a special Apostolic privilege to that end.

Any bishop may found a religious congregation; but before acting he must consult the Holy See. Such diocesan congregation, as long as it lacks papal approbation, remains under the jurisdiction of the bishop. If a diocesan congregation spreads into more than one diocese, the bishop of each diocese concerned exercises jurisdiction over it in respect of his diocese. No religious congregation, once established, may be suppressed except by the Holy See; but a bishop may close any house belonging to a diocesan congregation, subject to appeal to Rome, provided that he leaves at least one house of the congregation. No order or congregation may found a new house in any diocese without the bishop's consent, which must be had also for the building of its church or public oratory.

The bishop is by law obliged, once in every five years, to make a visitation of the houses of male and female diocesan congregations of Religious; and also of every convent of nuns in his diocese subject either to himself or to the Holy See. In the case last mentioned he, when authorised, acts as papal delegate. This visitation is comprehensive in all respects. Further, the bishop may visit the houses of certain clerical congregations which are directly under the Pope, including those that enjoy exemption, but only in what pertains to the church sacristy, the public oratory, and the confessional. Again, the list of confessors selected for nuns and sisters, and for lay institutes of men, must be submitted to the bishop for approval. The consent of the bishop is required in certain dealings with property belonging or entrusted to Religious. Religious, even the exempt, are directed to obey the bishop in the matter of the due application of Mass-stipends, and whenever from a motive of public utility he prescribes the ringing of bells, certain prayers, or sacred solemnities. Religious, even the exempt, are bound to obey when he commands them to appoint a member to expound the Gospel or some part of Christian doctrine in their public oratories. This much may suffice to indicate how the Religious come under the jurisdiction of the bishop.

Having now learnt what is meant by the ‘ Power of Jurisdiction ’ possessed by the bishop, we proceed to ask : When is it delivered to him ? by whom is it delivered ? and whence is it derived ? The answer to the last question has already been given : God is the source of ‘ ordinary ’ jurisdiction, and He has implanted it in the institution which we call the bishopric. Ordinary jurisdiction, therefore, is delivered in the bishopric to the person on whom it is conferred ; and the agent by whom it is delivered must be the collator of the bishopric. The present law leaves no room for doubting who he is, as a brief review of the process of making a Roman Catholic bishop will show : he is the Supreme Pontiff. It is the Pope who nominates to a vacant see, after examination as to fitness. The Pope alone judges whether the person proposed is fit. By the Pope is made the canonical provision or institution which constitutes his nominee bishop-elect of the diocese ; this confirmation of the appointment is effected either in consistory or by pontifical letters. From the Pope issue the letters authorising the consecration and induction of the elect. To the Pope is reserved the right of consecration of all bishops, so that no archbishop nor bishop may consecrate any one bishop unless he is certain that the Pope has issued his mandate to authorise such consecration.

This explicit provision of the Law, as it now stands, is not modified by any right of election or recommendation enjoyed by certain groups of persons, or by any government, through the indulgence of the Holy See. In several dioceses of Austria, Switzerland and Prussia, the Cathedral Chapter is authorised to elect. In England the Canons of the Cathedral select three names to send to Rome ; analogous arrangements are in force in Ireland and Scotland. The United States of America, Canada and Australia supply the ‘ Propaganda ’ at Rome periodically with the names of priests worthy of consideration for the work of a bishop. In Spain, Portugal and Peru the government presents a candidate to the Pope. Some South American Republics, though they have lost the right of presentation formerly secured to them by concordats now abolished, still continue to recommend names to the Pope. But however selected, proposed or recommended, the final choice rests with the Pope : no one can become a bishop until he is approved and nominated by the Supreme Pontiff.

At what point in the process of delivering the bishopric did the bishop receive his ‘ Power of Jurisdiction ’ ? Was it at the confirmation of his election, when he was instituted or provided to his future see ? or was it when he was consecrated bishop ? There can be little doubt what answer would generally be made. Episcopal Consecration is part of the Sacrament of Order, as accepted by Roman Catholics ; and their theologians teach that in Ordination *per se* no jurisdiction is communicated. Rather, so far as jurisdiction is concerned, what the ‘ Power of Order ’ brings to a bishop through his consecration is aptitude or capacity for Jurisdiction—an aptitude or capacity larger than what he needed to exercise the lesser jurisdiction that he wielded as a mere priest. The elect is not obliged to be consecrated for several weeks after his appointment, provided that the consecration takes place within three months from the date of issue of the Apostolic letters ; but he can enter on the government of his diocese as soon as he has presented the Letters Apostolic to his Cathedral Chapter. The commentators seem agreed in stating that, from the moment of presenting the Letters Apostolic, even before his consecration, the new bishop is entitled in his diocese to all rights of jurisdiction. It is noteworthy that the Law expressly says that the canonical provision or institution by the Pope 'constitutes him bishop of the vacant diocese.' Therefore we may conclude that, in the Roman Catholic Church, the 'Power of Jurisdiction' is delivered at the confirmation of election or appointment. It may be argued academically that, unless the nominee is already consecrated, some of the jurisdiction implanted in the bishopric lies dormant until consecration has brought him the requisite aptitude or capacity to exercise it to the full.

The delivery of jurisdiction has been the subject of much controversy in the past, and perhaps even now the dominant view is debatable. Before we turn away, we may add that it is acknowledged on all sides that in ancient times Metropolitans had the right of confirming and consecrating the bishops of their respective provinces. Nevertheless at Rome it would be maintained that this general practice existed for convenience, with the explicit or tacit consent of the Pope, which regularised it. The former custom is continued in the Church of England, where the confirmation of a bishop-elect is made by the Archbishop, or in certain circumstances by a Commission of Bishops. English canonists teach that such Confirmation 'commits to the bishop elected the care, government and administration of the spiritualities'; that after his confirmation the bishop-elect, even though unconsecrated, is 'fully invested to exercise all spiritual jurisdiction.'[1]

The bishop of a diocese in the Roman Catholic Church is bound directly to the See of Rome by close ties from the outset of his ministry; and this bond is maintained throughout, as we proceed to see. But, first, what strikes the student is, what might almost be described as, the disappearance of the Metropolitan, to whom is assigned an important place in the Canons of the First General Council.[2] Yet the Metropolitan still survives in the Roman Catholic Church, with diminished powers. Metropolitans are also called Archbishops, though these terms are not quite synonymous: the title 'Archbishop' may be merely an honorific distinction, as in the case of the Archbishop of Ferrara, who is not a Metropolitan. Every Metropolitan has a province, containing at least one other diocese besides his own. The creation of a province and a Metropolitical See is reserved to the Roman Pontiff, who appoints the Metropolitan; nor can the Metropolitan do any act as Metropolitan before he has received the 'pallium' from Rome. Inasmuch as all bishops, beneath the Pope himself, are equals by Divine right, whereas Metropolitans are the creation of ecclesiastical law, it follows that no Metropolitan has power over the bishops of his province (known commonly as his suffragans), except that which is given by the Law or by the Pope.

---

[1] Phillimore.

[2] Nicaea, A.D. 325.

The Metropolitan, at present, is authorised to see that faith and discipline are observed in the dioceses of his suffragans, and to report abuses at once to Rome. He is responsible for convening and presiding at the Provincial Council, which must be held once in twenty years. He is empowered to institute to benefices in a suffragan's diocese if the suffragan fails to institute within the prescribed time. He can, with the Pope's approval, hold the canonical visitation in the diocese of a suffragan, if the latter has neglected his duty. He may perform pontifical functions and give blessing in all the churches of the province, whether exempt or not; but he may not do other things which may imply interference with a bishop's ordinary jurisdiction in his diocese. Appeals can be made to him from the courts of his suffragans. On the death of a suffragan he appoints the vicar-capitular, if the Cathedral Chapter has failed to appoint within eight days. He enjoys the privilege of granting indulgences for a hundred days in any diocese of his province, whereas the bishop of a diocese can grant but fifty.

After this digression we return to our question: How is the bond between the bishop of a diocese and the See of Rome maintained? Before his canonical institution or provision there is demanded of him the profession of faith as ordered by the Canons, and the oath of fidelity to the

Roman Pontiff. The consequences of the oath may be very far reaching. Once in every five years the bishop is obliged to send a report on his diocese to the Pope ; and in the same year he must visit Rome personally (or by his coadjutor, or his representative approved by the Holy See), and present himself to the successor of St. Peter. If a bishop is guilty of a crime he is summoned for judgment before the Roman Pontiff himself. If the bishop is involved in a contentious action the case is tried before the Court of the Sacred Rota at Rome, except where it relates to the bishop's temporal rights, etc. or to the Diocesan Court. Besides all this there is another link which is of enduring strength, namely, the system of Papal Dispensations and Faculties.

Now before we deal with these, we had better clear the ground by inquiring whether there are Episcopal Dispensations and Faculties, as distinguished from the Papal ; that is to say, has the bishop an undelegated power, as part of the jurisdiction implanted in his bishopric, to grant dispensations and faculties to the clergy and laity of his diocese ? It is certain that the bishop, of his own power or Ordinary Jurisdiction, can grant faculties to those priests in his diocese, who otherwise would have no right, to hear Confessions, to say Mass, and to preach. In respect of dispensations, the bishop can dispense the faithful of his diocese from diocesan laws, and also, in particular cases, where justice requires, from provincial laws, provided the laws have not been specifically approved by the Pope. The bishop cannot, of himself, dispense from the Common Law of the Church, except where the Law allows, unless there be danger in delay and recourse to the Holy See is difficult, in which event the bishop may grant such dispensation as he knows is usually granted at Rome in applications of the kind. The Law allows the bishop to dispense from the prescribed examinations, from occult irregularities, from banns of marriage, from impediments of ecclesiastical law in certain cases, and from fasting and abstinence and from the observation of feasts in special circumstances. Beyond the points mentioned the bishop cannot go in granting dispensations or faculties to the clergy and laity of his diocese, unless he himself has received a Papal faculty to grant them. If the bishop has no such Apostolic or Papal faculty, the clergy and laity of his diocese must have recourse to Rome.

No one less than the Roman Pontiff, or one commissioned by the Roman Pontiff to act for him, can dispense from the Universal or Common Law of the Church. From the Divine Law not even the Pope can dispense: but from certain vows, and from all ecclesiastical laws he can dispense, being shown a just and reasonable cause. The principle which regulates the issue of papal dispensations is this: the closer the ecclesiastical law in question approaches to the Divine or Natural Law, the more difficult it is to obtain dispensation. Thus far the matter stands for those who wish to deviate from the Law. What of those who have already broken it? Where the sin or offence has not been reserved to the judgment of the bishop of the diocese, or that of the Supreme Pontiff, the offenders are dealt with by their parish priests or their confessors. But certain heinous sins and grievous offences are reserved for the cognisance of the Holy See; in these cases absolution from or remission of ecclesiastical censures can be had only of the Roman Pontiff or his lawful delegate. It is evident that if the offender were obliged to go in person to Rome for the remission wanted, the obligation would often be a bar to all practical remedy. Common sense has prevailed; since 1637 it has been customary for a General Faculty or Indult to be issued by the Pope to bishops and other Ordinaries, empowering them as his delegates to grant absolution, remission or dispensation, in certain of the matters reserved by Law to the judgment of the Supreme Pontiff. These faculties are known as the 'Quinquennial Faculties' because they are in force for five years only, at the end of which period application for a renewal of the faculties must be made. They are sometimes called 'Habitual' because they remain in force notwithstanding the loss of personal jurisdiction (through death or other cause) of the individual to whom they are granted, and pass on to his successor in the same office. Consequently those who want remissions or dispensations in cases reserved to the Roman See, can apply to the bishop of the diocese who holds the Papal Faculty to issue them.

The grant of a Quinquennial Faculty to a bishop is an act of grace, or voluntary concession, on the part of the Supreme Pontiff. He is under no obligation to give it; and at his will he may withhold it. As a matter of fact the privilege has occasionally been withdrawn from, or refused to, bishops who had incurred the censure or displeasure of the Holy See. The lack of the Papal faculty causes a good deal of inconvenience and trouble to the clergy and laity of the diocese; and it lowers the personal prestige of the bishop, who probably becomes a suspect or a marked man in Church circles. One is tempted to ask why the ecclesiastical law could not, ere now, have superseded these faculties by making all diocesan bishops the permanent delegates of the Holy Father in these reserved cases. The answer presumably would be that the Quinquennial Faculties, like the Quinquennial report and visit to Rome, are a useful means to keep the bishops in touch with the Roman Court, and to steady them in the attitude of respectful reverence to their Supreme Head. The problem whether the whole arrangement between Pope and bishop is consistent with the Divine institution of Episcopacy, which is an article of faith for Roman Catholics, or with the actual course of ecclesiastical history, lies outside the scope of this essay, which has been to describe, as accurately as possible, Episcopacy as it is to-day in the Roman Catholic Church.

VI

EPISCOPACY IN THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH

By W. A. Wigram

The question that we have for discussion is the matter of Episcopacy in the Orthodox Church. How is it regarded, as an institution, by the Christians of that body, and how, as an institution, is it worked? That is to say, how are bishops appointed; and when appointed in what relation do they stand towards the Œcumenical Patriarch, to the clergy of their own dioceses, and to the monastic orders who may have houses within diocesan borders? Other questions are: what is the liturgical authority of a bishop, and what is his connection with the government of his land? Also, what relations exist between him or the Church he stands for and 'Protestant' or non-episcopal churches?

To answer this question and also the various questions into which it is divided, it is needful to go back to first principles and to see first what 'the Church' means to the Orthodox Christian. Then, having grasped that, one may be able to see what Episcopacy is and what it stands for in that Church. That done we may be able to see how the principles that are part of the common heritage of all are applied in and by the 'autocephalous' and 'autonomous' churches that make up the one Orthodox communion. These are a large and increasing number, and their importance and circumstances both vary greatly. Hence the superficial differences between them are many, a fact that makes the unity of principle more striking and important.

Theory of the Church. The whole conception of the Church, to the mind of an Eastern Christian, is ‘ mystical ’ to a degree unfamiliar to the ordinary Western, if we may define a mystic as one who looks through the appearance of things to the spiritual reality that is behind that appearance and veiled by it.

Thus to him the Church is, according to the Pauline ideal, the embodiment of the life of God in the mind of man, and so ‘ the Body of Christ.’ All human spirits that believe in Christ, those that are now on earth, those that have been so, those that shall be so in the future, are members of the Body. The thought that only a small part of the Church is on earth, and that far the larger and more important part of it is beyond the veil, is one that is accepted verbally by the Western, but is allowed to drop to the back of his mind. It moulds the whole active mind of the Eastern. His instinctive resentment of the idea that the Church being a body must have a head on earth is only one instance of the effect that this concept has upon his thought.

Having thus existed *ab initio mundi*, the Church, which is holy and is the vehicle of the spirit of truth, is naturally unchangeable, at least in her internal essence. To those outside her she may seem to change, even as, for instance, an unchanging object may seem to change shape and colour, according as it is seen from different angles or through different coloured glasses. The seeming change, however, is in the outsider not in the object. The Church, the pillar and ground of the truth, is unchanging, as is God who is the Truth. She is the Body of Him who is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever.

Naturally this Body, being in many lands and under many conditions, may have local names and local freedom of action, in the matter of ceremonies for instance ; no part, however, can do what affects the whole without the concurrence of the whole. The formulation of doctrine in the Creed is obviously something that comes under that description, and therefore, for any one part of the Church to alter that Creed by itself, and still more to demand that others shall follow it in that action, is essentially wrong. It is not only a wrong act, it is an act of self-severance from the Body, or rather—seeing that the act is a proof that Love, the bond of perfectness and unity, has already failed—it is a sign that severance has already taken place. In the same way any limb of the body that falls into grave error is not cut off from the body by the act of any authority in it. The fact that it has proclaimed error and persisted in it is a sign that it has already cut itself off. ‘ Heresy ’ is not error, even of the gravest. It is that self-assertive separation of spirit that is the natural interpretation of the word, and that is at the root of all schisms in the Body. That it should lead direct to error, or to a loss of the proportion of the faith, is natural and inevitable.

As the life of the Church is the life of the Body of Christ, the Body has the power of distinguishing truth from error, and as it can do this without fail it is ‘ infallible.’ This infallibility, however, is not a gift or a quasi-magical endowment attached to any one organisation, such as a council or a group of patriarchs. Still less is it to be thought of as the possession of any one official or bishop. There is no *charisma infallibilitatis* in either council or pope. Councils may reveal the consciousness of the Church, and it is in so far as they do that that they are themselves infallible. They are then the organ of the inherent infallibility of the Church. There are many doctrines of the Church that have never received the endorsement of any ‘ general council.’

The infallibility of the Church is a characteristic of the life of the whole body. A living body as a whole has the power to accept and assimilate what is ‘ good,’ *i.e.* in accord with the principle of its life ; it rejects by the same power what is ‘ bad,’ and not in such accord. A living body may be some time in getting rid of any discordant element, such as the microbes of disease, or in transforming them, if they are transformable ; but it does it, infallibly, by virtue of the life that is in it. So in the living Body of the Church, it is the presence of the Spirit that is Life and Love, that Love which knits unity and produces the corporate character that judges truth aright. It is the pure in heart that can see God and reflect Him, and lack of love dims the seeing eye and the reflecting mirror.

So to speak of 'Church authority' in these matters is too external a statement. It is the spirit of love in the body that has power. It is from this angle that the 'orthodox-trained mind' approaches the question of the sacraments. They are acts of the Church, of the whole body. Thus a self-separated organisation can no more have valid sacraments than one separated leg can walk, or one separated joint grasp. And as they are the acts of the whole body, on earth and beyond, all that body has a share in them. All living, some even say all departed, including the saints and the Panagia, are the partakers of the Eucharist. It is an extension of the thought of St. Paul; he said to Christians, 'ye are one body because ye are all partakers of the one bread,' and the mystic thinker among the Orthodox says, 'because ye are one body, therefore ye must be, in some wise, all partakers.' The point now is how they apply that principle to the sacrament of ordination.

An ordination or consecration, to Orthodox thinking, is the act of the whole Church, the Body of Christ, and the act of Christ who is the Head of the Body, acting through the organ that is set apart for that action, the bishop. It is the Body as a whole that has the continuous life, and the Body as a whole that has the powers, though they are exercised and exercisable only through the organ. In like fashion in the human body it is the whole man that has the power of speech or the power of passing on the gift of life to another, even though specialised organs may be needed. The act is the act of the whole being through the appropriate organ. It is not the act of the organ apart from the whole.

So when considering 'Apostolic Succession,' the idea of a separate life of the Episcopate, the idea of what is sometimes described as a 'golden pipe down from the Apostles,' is simply not in the Orthodox scheme of things. There is Apostolic Succession because there is continuity of life and of thought in the whole body, but that life must be transmitted by those to whom the Church has given the duty.

Ordination without bishops is unthinkable, but so also is ordination by bishops who are not entitled to act, because they are acting apart from others. This is a truth that needs guarding, for efforts have been made of late to secure ordinations and consecration from ‘ stray bishops ’ acting alone, a procedure that would open the door to just that conception of a mechanical transmission against which the Orthodox Church protests. One who ordains—or celebrates any sacrament—apart from the Church has by the fact of his so acting apart severed himself from the living Body of Christ that is his own source of power.

To ask whether a schismatic can ordain or whether there can be valid orders apart from Orthodox doctrine and fellowship in the Body, is like asking whether severed lips can speak. Bishop and priest have their power, but in the Body and in love, and so only. How necessary it is, however, to all Orthodox belief, that the power should be exercised by the bishop who has the right so to do, appears from the story of the ‘ Old Believers ’ in Russia. Regarding the bishops collectively as having apostatised and so severed themselves from the Church and lost their power, it never occurred to the ‘ faithful remnant ’ that they might make priests for themselves by any sort of Presbyterian ordination. They continued their corporate life without priests or sacraments till such time as God in His own way should restore a true episcopate. They used the Church rites or such parts of them as a layman may lawfully say, and no others.

It is sometimes urged in the West that as ordination is the act of the Body as a whole, acting normally through the bishops who have specially been set apart for the work, that therefore the Body or its local representatives might exercise the power that is in them, though normally latent, if for any reason no bishops should be available.

An Orthodox thinker would reply that it is hardly profitable to argue whether such power would be actually ‘ latent ’ in any body of Christians, seeing that to assume it by the attempt to use such power in an act that would break Church unity, would be in fact to break the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. An act that would create a schism would be an act against the spirit of love, and would be in itself a form of self-severance from the one source of all spiritual power.

He does not say, however, that any one system of government was definitely laid down by Christ. It is enough that one was established by the action of the Apostles, His plenipotentiaries, and has become the custom of His living Body, from which no man or body of men may sever themselves without sin. It is the intent to remain in the Body and to avoid a division in it that is judged to be of the first importance.

It is, so far as we can judge, on this principle that sacramental acts, defective in themselves, may be accepted 'in the way of economy.' Any act may be accepted as valid by the Church if it seems to have been done without the intent to cause a schism in the body, or even if those who are the heirs of an evil past—as are Anglicans in the matter of their use of the 'Filioque' clause in the Creed—show a true spirit of unity. It is the Orthodox Church, the only true Church, that is sole judge in this matter.

Having thus made the attempt to show how the Orthodox Church envisages Episcopacy as an institution, one may proceed further and describe how it works or is worked in the rapidly changing world of the East that has stood comparatively still for so long and now is developing so quickly.

The Orthodox Communion is now a federation of fourteen or more 'autocephalous' churches, all of which follow a common tradition of worship and theology. Less than a century ago it might have been described as consisting of four ancient Patriarchates—those of Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Constantinople—with the tiny 'autocephalous' Church of Cyprus following their orbits like a minute satellite. Three of the four ancient Patriarchates had become comparatively unimportant, relatively to the fourth. Owing to historical circumstances that one, Constantinople, had overshadowed its brethren and had become 'the Œcumenical Patriarchate.' In the course of the last century political changes—notably the decline of the Ottoman Empire—have so worked that many provinces of the old Œcumenical Patriarchate have now been recognised as the 'autocephalous churches' of the independent nations that have won back their freedom from the

Turk, though it is true that in some cases the new freedom both in Church and State is the revival of some old mediaeval claim. Actually the result of these developments has been an increase in the importance of the new autocephalous churches and a relative decline in that of Constantinople. Still, the Œcumenical Patriarchate, if its actual jurisdiction is but the shadow of what it once was, remains indisputably *primus inter pares* among the Patriarchs of the East, and has by no means lost in real dignity from the fact that those prelates are now far more than four in number. The autocephalous churches are entirely self-governed, and in case of serious disagreement suspension of communion is the only means of discipline at the disposal of any sister Church. There is nothing, for instance, like the system whereby faculties for the performance of certain necessary duties are given for a limited period by some central authority, and may be withdrawn if there is any reason to suspect independence of spirit in a bishop or archbishop. The Œcumenical Patriarch can give advice to a brother Patriarch, and perhaps need not even wait till that advice has been asked for. He can ask for information which can hardly be refused. Should an Œcumenical Synod ever be able to meet he would be its president *de jure*, and he would issue the invitations to it and appoint the place of meeting. It is the fact that he is not at present in a condition to do this that has made the convocation of such a council impossible. While the Patriarch of Constantinople is thus in a position that can be compared to that now occupied by the Archbishop of Canterbury among the Metropolitans of the Anglican Communion, he is in no sense a Pope. It is only the bishops of his own immediate province that owe obedience to him. Others owe it to their own Patriarchs.

The 'Jus Liturgicum' of the Bishops. In all the branches of the Orthodox Communion there is a liturgical tradition that is established and broadly uniform. The existence of considerable differences of language makes this uniformity the more impressive. It is such a uniformity of tradition as existed, say, in the Church of England from the time of the formation of the Book of Common Prayer up to

1840, though, being far more ancient, it is proportionately more venerable. Bishops can see that it is followed and, if public opinion should fail to do so, they can make clergy officiate according to it and to the rules and canons that dictate it.

There is no demand, however, for 'up-to-date services,' and no desire for change in the fashion of worship, even if there may be a general desire for more instruction, in the form of sermons and the like. These are at least much appreciated when the clergy can give them. In these circumstances the *jus liturgicum* of the bishops, in the sense of a power to disallow new services or changes in the accustomed form of old ones, can hardly be said to exist or to be needed.

Appointment of Clergy. In Greece at any rate, and to the best of our belief in other Orthodox lands also, the clergy are chosen, without formal election, by the folk of the parish, and they are appointed and, if not already in orders, ordained by the bishop. Once in a parish they can be removed to another, either in the original diocese or in another, provided that they consent and that the two parishes concerned are willing. Of course, the approval of the bishop or of both bishops must also be forthcoming. Failing those necessary conditions, however, a duly appointed parish priest may be very hard to remove, even on proven misbehaviour, almost as hard as if he held a rector's freehold in England, though the law has not been formulated in that particular way. We have been told of a case in Cyprus where a village had demanded the ordination of a certain man of strong character as their pastor and found that he ruled them with a thick stick, if not with a rod of iron. Their complaint was that he would shorten the services on great festivals out of laziness. It is true that nobody was quite sure what he had left out in the three hours that the full service of Easter Day requires for recitation, but they were certain that something had gone. When they complained, however, and asked the bishop for his removal they were told that it was impossible on the case as shown. 'You asked for him and now you have got him; unless another village asks for him and he is willing to go, nothing can be done.' Where there is a moral misconduct, flagrant and proven, the bishop can proceed in due process and punish the guilty by deposition from his orders ; still, in Orthodox lands as elsewhere, legal proof of such misconduct is often hard to come by, and bishops are slow to grasp difficult situations where they are very apt to burn their own fingers. Thus, while there is not a legal freehold tenure of the parish by the incumbent, there is something that has much the same effect. At the least, a bishop cannot remove a man *proprio motu*, nor is he bound to go after a certain number of years.

As for the parish funds they are administered in theory by a board of ' Epitropi ' who correspond to our churchwardens. The clergy are supported, as with us in an earlier age, by the proceeds of their glebes, and by fees payable for clerical duties. Each parish is expected to make a contribution to a general ' diocesan fund,' from which grants may be made to needy cases.

Monasteries. The bishop of the diocese is normally and theoretically the ' Visitor ' of all monasteries within his jurisdiction, and is entitled to see that the rule of the house is properly observed. It is true that, at times, this control is not easy to exercise. We have known of a case in Yugo-Slavia where the Father Abbot of a certain small house—an old Komitadji who had sought ordination when there was no more fighting to do—was rather a thorn in the side of a reforming bishop. When his lordship came to visit and inspect it was found that the monastery bull had unaccountably got loose.

In monasteries, as in the parochial life of the Church, there is a fixed tradition to be followed which is authoritative. Human slackness and laziness may mean that the rule is not kept as strictly as it once was, but the tradition of what ought to be done is clear.

There is, therefore, no idea of altering the rule or of improving it by adopting rites or customs from outside. The only reform that can be needed, if any be needed at all, is to go back to the good customs of the Fathers in old time.

Just as in the West in old days there were monasteries that claimed to be subject only to the Pope, and were quite outside all diocesan life and jurisdiction, so in the East there are houses that are subordinate only to the Œcumenical Patriarch, and pay no regard to the bishop of the diocese. These are known as 'Stauropegia,' but there are far fewer of them, proportionately, than was the case in England of old, where it was the ambition of every monastery to get such a grant of exemption by payment to the papal officials.

In the whole of 'Old Greece' there is only one of the kind, Megaspelaeon in Achaea. Practically all of the group of twenty 'Great Monasteries' on Mount Athos have the privilege, but their position was that of a 'Peculiar.'

In old days the monastic endowments were nominally under the control of the bishop or patriarch in the case of a Stauropegion; the fact, however, that such a change in the administrative routine, as is implied in the change from the 'Cœnobitic' to the 'Idio-rhythmic'[1] system, could take place without anybody quite knowing how it was done, or why, or without putting the change on record, shows that there were days when episcopal supervision was rather slack. This is quite natural, not to say inevitable, under the rule of the Turk, for he is apt to look upon any display of official activity as in itself suspicious. With him the standing order is, or was in old days, 'thou shalt do nothing at all.' Now, since the year 1910, at any rate in Greece, the monastic endowments generally are under the control of a general financial board, and the bishop can exercise a personal influence only. The application of much of the landed property of the monasteries to the needs of the many refugees who have poured into the land has brought the monks into the position of mere rent-receivers, if the said rent can be got. They no longer manage or farm their own lands.

Relations with Non-Episcopal Churches. Formally and officially the Orthodox Church has not and cannot have any relations with other bodies. Like the Church of Rome she is herself the Church Catholic, and any other organisation has only to submit to her. In so far as they differ from her, at least in essentials—and the Orthodox

---

[1] The monks of an Idio-rhythmic monastery have no abbot, and are divided into little 'self-governing' groups, hence the name.

Church is judge as to what is essential, though she may admit the charitable principle of 'Œconomy'—they are wrong. Actually though, many of her bishops are theologians, and there are other trained theologians—laymen among them—in her seminaries. Most of these have studied in European universities, usually in Germany, and so have got into touch with Lutheran and Evangelical teachers and thought. Naturally this has affected them and, no matter how thorough their loyalty to the Church of their fathers, they have remained on a friendly footing with their old teachers, and have usually taken their thought as the measure of all non-Roman theology.

Official relations then there are none. Mental relations may sometimes be close and friendly. Those who are aware—as now most educated men among the Orthodox are aware—that the Church of England stands for something different from continental Protestantism, say frankly that they would much prefer to send their young men to study at English universities and under English professors. Unfortunately the cost in an English university is absolutely prohibitive. It is one of the things that stand in the way of the growing understanding between Anglicanism and Orthodoxy, and it is hard to remove.

Appointment of Bishops and their Relation to the State. This is a matter which varies in every Orthodox land and, indeed, seeing how rapidly things are altering in those lands, often varies in a very short space of time in one land. Certain conditions are universal in all Orthodox communities, as, for instance, the custom—for I know of no canon that lays down the law on the subject—that bishops should always be unmarried and therefore usually monks.

Constantinople. The Œcumenical Patriarch was once the recognised head of all Orthodox Ottoman subjects and so was nominated by the Sultan, 'the Ruler of all Greeks.' Now with the decline of Turkey and the expulsion or extermination of almost all Greeks and the organisation of a set of autocephalous churches, his power has become a shadow. There are four Greek diocesan bishops (now all called 'Metropolitans') in Turkey, where there once were hundreds, and though there are some fifty others in the

Patriarchate, they are in Greece or elsewhere. By custom the Patriarch must act in Synod, composed of at least eleven Metropolitans, and he is elected by it. Now, seeing that no bishop from outside the empire is permitted to take part in the election, the minimum number is kept up by titulars, men in episcopal orders but not exercising jurisdiction over dioceses, who do secretarial work at the 'Phanar,' which is the Orthodox Vatican or Lambeth.

The eleven bishops meet in the Phanar and elect three candidates, all of whom are known to be unobjectionable to the Ottoman authority. Then they adjourn to the Cathedral and elect one of the three to the Patriarchate. The elect must be an Ottoman subject and have been at least seven years in Episcopal orders. He cannot leave Constantinople, and is practically unable to act in any way as the leading authority of a world-wide Church. He is, till things shall mend, a mere melancholy survival, the religious chief of a poor remnant of 'rayahs,' hated, despised and suspected by their governors. Yet admittedly he is *primus inter pares* among all Œcumenical Patriarchs.

Antioch and Alexandria. These also are little but survivals now and the representatives of great names in a past age. Only thirteen and seven bishops respectively follow those who once had hundreds behind them, and even the separated national churches (Syrian and Coptic) that drew off the bulk of the Christians of the old Patriarchates into separation have now but a remnant of followers. Both Patriarchs act in 'petty Synod,' in conjunction, that is, with a few bishops who are practically resident in the official house and with a small board of lay assessors. The Patriarchs are elected by a body composed of all the bishops of their obedience, coupled with two or three lay representatives from each diocese. By custom, this 'Mixed Body' draws up a list of eligibles from which the government has the right to delete any names that it objects to. The Mixed Body then draws up a list of three from whom the bishops elect one.

In the case of Diocesan Bishops the clergy and laity of the diocese draw up a 'short list' of three from which the Synod of Bishops chooses one.

Jerusalem. Jerusalem is an exception, as being a Patriarchate that is almost without Diocesan Bishops. The Patriarch is Abbot of the Monastery of the Holy Sepulchre, a House where many of the monks are in episcopal orders and which has as its chief duty the care of the Holy Places.

At present the monastery is almost entirely Greek, not Arab-speaking, and is maintained by the Orthodox world at large. This national character, however, dates only from the Ottoman conquest of Palestine.

Greece. Branches of the Orthodox Church that live under Christian powers enjoy varying degrees of self-government and of collaboration with the state. Thus in Greece the Church, till the days of Greek independence, was no more than so many dioceses in the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The Church proclaimed its own autocephalous character as soon as Greek independence was recognised by the Turk in 1830, but this was not recognised for twenty years later by the Phanar. That organisation is always apt to delay the inevitable recognition of independence till the act has lost all grace.

From 1850 to 1923 the established Church of Greece was governed by the Archbishop of Athens, acting in the 'petty Synod' of the five senior bishops. Actually the proceedings of this Synod were controlled by the 'Minister of Religion and Education,' who also advised the King on the choice of bishops. The Synod, under the Minister's advice, selected three men from whom the King made his choice. Not even the Church of England was more thoroughly controlled.

In 1923 the Archbishop of Athens procured a grant of complete self-government from the ruler of the day. A full Synod of all the bishops of the land was allowed to meet annually and pass any canons for the government of the Church. A lay procurator was present but had no veto, and the 'petty Synod' became a mere working committee of the greater.

In 1925 this system was abolished by decree of the then Dictator, but he having since vanished, a scheme is now on foot for the restoration of the 1923 scheme with small modifications.

Bishops are now chosen by the presentation of a list of 'possibles,' drawn up by the Synod, to the Minister of Education, who removes any names, up to half the total, that he objects to. The Synod then draw up what a Scottish parish electing its minister would call a 'short leet' of three, from whom, after an interval, they make their choice.

Clergy in like fashion are elected by the parish from a list of men approved by the bishop.

Yugo-Slavia. The Church of Yugo-Slavia is comprehensible only from its history. Mediaeval Serbia dreamed, like all Balkan states, of a Balkan Empire, and had its Patriarchal seat at Ipek. Church autonomy in the land was lost by the Turkish conquest of 1459, which put the Church under Greek bishops, agents of the Phanar. A century later, however, the Serbian Patriarchate was revived. A Janissary of Serb blood (Mehmed Sokol) became Grand Vizir, and made his monk brother Patriarch of the land and its own Church. Then in 1690 a great Serb rising failed and thousands of Serbs migrated, the Patriarch with them, to Karlovci in Hungary and established themselves there. The Ipek line of Patriarchs continued, however, so that there were two Serb Patriarchs, till in 1766 that of Ipek was suppressed once more and the land put again under 'Phanariot bishops.'

In 1830 the tiny state of New Serbia won its independence and at once proclaimed its Church autonomous and expelled the Greek bishops. Those put in their places were mostly men who had fought in the war of independence and selected for that rather than for learning.

It was not till 1879 that the Phanar, then under the statesman Joachim III, recognised the autonomous Serb Church, and not till 1920 that all Serbs found themselves in one 'Yugo-Slavia.' Then the Metropolitan of Belgrade, Dmitri, became also Archbishop of Ipek and Karlovci and Patriarch of Yugo-Slavia, and the Serbian Church was at last complete.

At the election of future Patriarchs, the bishops, sitting in Synod, will select three names, and an electoral congress, composed of the bishops and the lay dignitaries of the nation, will select one of the three. Bishops are selected by the Episcopal Synod after consultation with the diocese, and the executive authority is a ‘small Synod’ of four bishops, elected by their brethren from among themselves, with the Patriarch. A state procurator sits in the Synod, but has no vote.

Bulgaria. Bulgaria had also its mediaeval dream of Empire and its Patriarch, who had his seat at Ochrida. When Church and nation both fell, the Patriarch was kept on awhile as the instrument of Greek Church government, but was soon suppressed. When the nation rose again the Church rose with it as usual; but in this case the resentment felt by the Phanar at the claim for an autocephalous Church was so keen that the recognition has not been made yet, and the Bulgarian Church is not in communion with Constantinople.[1] At present the ‘Exarch’ of this Church, who had his seat in Constantinople at first and only moved to Sofia in 1913, is elected by the bishops acting as a body, their choice being confirmed by the government. He rules in a ‘small Synod’ of four Metropolitans, also elected by the bishops. Bishops are elected by the clergy and lay representatives of each diocese, who present two candidates to the Episcopal Synod, which body then selects one, subject again to government approval.

Roumania. Here again a national Church has been manufactured, quite lately, by the union of five Orthodox Churches in as many outlying provinces, each of which has had its own story and troubles, and began by being just so many dioceses in the Œcumenical Patriarchate. Wallachia, Moldavia, Bukovina, Transylvania, and Bessarabia—until the days of the Great War they were hardly known in England, and now are in process of being forgotten. Here a Church that has hardly learnt to look upon itself as one has a constitution of an almost ‘ready-made’ variety that will probably have to be adapted to fit the body.

The Patriarch is elected by the eighteen bishops of the land, by the members of the National Ecclesiastical Congress, and by the members of Parliament who happen to be members of the Orthodox Church, all sitting as one body. The Patriarch presides, of course, in the Synod of

---

[1] It is quite possible that this schism may be healed very shortly.

Bishops—though at the moment his duties as regent of the kingdom leave him scant time to do so—and a lay procurator is present with no vote.

The Lower House of the Synod consists of the Congress mentioned above, formed by two clerical and four lay representatives from each diocese. Each diocese has also its 'diocesan assembly,' of which one-third is clerical, two-thirds lay.

Bishops, who must have a degree in theology of a Roumanian university, are elected by the National Congress, the Diocesan Assembly of the diocese concerned, and by the Ministers of State, all sitting as one body. After election they must be invested by the King.

They must act in the Diocesan Assembly, and there is a significant rule that half the property of every bishop reverts to his diocese on his decease. A bishop is *ex officio* visitor of all monasteries in his diocese, and has the right of selecting the abbot from a 'short leet' drawn up and presented by the monks of the house.

VII

EPISCOPACY IN THE CHURCH OF SWEDEN

By C. B. Moss.

Before the Reformation the Church of Sweden was a single province of Latin Christendom, consisting of the archbishopric of Upsala and six bishoprics, Linköping, Skara, Strengnäs, Vesterås, Vexiö, and Åbo in Finland. The Gospel was first preached in Sweden by St. Anskar in the ninth century, but the Church was not firmly settled, nor the boundaries of dioceses fixed, until the twelfth century. Sweden was a remote country, and the central authority of Rome was always weak: it was never possible, for instance, to enforce clerical celibacy. But mediaeval Sweden produced one saint of universal fame, St. Birgitta of Vadstena, the foundress of the Brigittine Order, who died at Rome in 1373.

The Swedish Reformation came about in this way. Since 1397 Sweden had been joined with Denmark and Norway under one sovereign by the Union of Kalmar. The King lived in Denmark, and governed through 'administrators.' The Church was free from the grosser abuses of the time, such as the appointment of non-resident Italians to bishoprics and the sale of indulgences, but the wealth of the bishops and the higher clergy was out of all proportion to that of the country as a whole.

King Christian II, who came to the throne in 1513, was supported against the nationalist party in Sweden by Archbishop Gustaf Trolle, who had a family feud with the Stures, the leading family in Sweden. In 1517 the archbishop was degraded, as a traitor to his country, by a unanimous vote of the Swedish Estates; his castle was razed to the ground, and he was thrown into prison. A papal legate named Arcimboldi came to Sweden, and, being bribed by the administrator and his party, confirmed the sentence against the archbishop, who at once resigned. The legate hoped to succeed him and to be able to live in Italy on the revenues of the see, but in this he was disappointed. Christian II invaded Sweden, bringing with him a papal excommunication of all those concerned in the deposition of Trolle. Relying on his promises, the citizens of Stockholm admitted him to the city, whereupon he treacherously put to death most of the nationalist leaders, including two bishops, twelve noblemen, the burgomasters of Stockholm, and many leading citizens. This was known as the Blood Bath of Stockholm, and was followed by more executions in other parts of Sweden and Finland. Altogether more than 600 persons, including monks and innocent children, were beheaded.

A general revolt of Swedish patriots against the Danes followed. The leader was Gustaf Vasa, a young nobleman not yet twenty-five, who rallied the peasants round him, drove the Danes out of the country, and was elected King in 1523. The Swedes were determined never again to be ruled by a foreign king, or to have an archbishop so powerful as Gustaf Trolle. Sweden was almost bankrupt, for the treasure of the kingdom was in Denmark; and the Church was the only source from which the necessary money could be obtained. At the Riksdag of Vesterås in 1527 the King, supported by the burgesses and the peasants, carried a resolution authorising the seizure of the property of the bishops, chapters and convents by the King and nobles. The King was given general supremacy over the Church, and the preachers of the reformed doctrines obtained liberty to proclaim their message. The King needed properly consecrated bishops to crown him, and Petrus Magni, Bishop of Vesterås, who had himself been consecrated at Rome on May 1, 1524, consecrated three bishops. The first reformed archbishop, Laurentius Petri, was consecrated by Petrus Magni and Magnus Sommar of Strengnäs on September 22, 1521; he held the see of

Upsala for the next forty-two years. Thus the Reformation was introduced very gradually. The Mass was first said in Swedish in 1525. The cathedral chapters, which were all secular, not monastic, were dissolved by King Gustaf, who took possession of their revenues. The Swedish Bible, including the Apocrypha, was published in 1541; it was the work of the archbishop and his brother Olaus Petri. No reformed confession of faith was accepted until 1593, when the Confession of Augsburg in its unaltered form was accepted by the Assembly of Upsala, in order to prevent Calvinism from being introduced into the Church by Duke Charles, son of Gustaf Vasa, who afterwards ascended the throne as Charles IX. To this day, though the Church of Sweden is in many ways profoundly Lutheran in outlook, she is not officially called Lutheran, but simply 'The Church of Sweden.'

The episcopal succession has been carefully maintained. The following line of consecrators is given by Bishop Mott Williams[1]:

Petrus Magni, Västerås.
Laurentius Petri, Upsala.
J. J. Vestrogothus, Skara.
Petrus Benedicti, Linköping.
Abraham Angermannus, Upsala.
Petrus Kenicius, Skara.
Olaus Martini, Upsala.
Laurentius Paulinus Gothus, Strengnäs, tr. to Upsala.
Jonas Magni, Skara.
John Canuti Lennaeus, Upsala.
J. Bazius, Vexiö, tr. to Upsala.
Olof Svebilius, Linköping, tr. to Upsala.
Eric Benzelius, Upsala.
Jesper Svedberg, Skara.
John Steuchius, Linköping, tr. to Upsala.
C. F. Mennauder, Åbo, tr. to Upsala.
Uno von Troil, Linköping, tr. to Upsala.
Jacob Axelsson Lindblom, Linköping, tr. to Upsala.
C. von Rosenstein, Linköping, tr. to Upsala.

---

[1] *Church of Sweden and the Anglican Communion*, p. 59.

John Olaf Wallin, Bishop for the Order of St. Seraphim, tr. to Upsala.
H. O. Holmsström, Strengnäs, tr. to Upsala.
Henry Reuterdahl, Lund, tr. to Upsala.
Anton Niklas Sundberg, Karlstad, tr. to Upsala.
J. A. Ekman, Upsala (the immediate predecessor of the present archbishop).

A commission appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and consisting of Bishops Herbert Ryle, John Wordsworth, and Mott Williams, Dr. A. J. Mason, and Chancellor E. R. Bernard, examined the historical evidence most carefully, and came to the conclusion that the validity of the succession could not be denied. An independent investigation was undertaken by the theological committee of the English Church Union ; they agreed that the actual succession has been preserved, but expressed some doubt as to the intention.

The Lambeth Conference of 1920 accepted the validity of Swedish Orders, and recommended that Swedes in good standing, out of reach of their own church, might be admitted to communion in Anglican churches. But no permission seems to have been given for Anglicans to communicate in Swedish churches. The Bishops of Durham (Dr. Henson) and Peterborough (Dr. Woods) assisted at the consecration of the Bishops of Vesterås and Visby on September 19, 1920.

The question of the validity of Swedish Orders has never been officially considered at Rome, because, apparently, no Swedish priest has sought to become a Roman priest. But Dr. Spalding, a Roman bishop in America, and a Roman priest writing in the Swedish Roman newspaper, have agreed that the historical succession is undeniable. The only objections that can be raised are those which are also raised against Anglican Orders : absence of intention and insufficiency of rite.

The only argument brought against the intention of the Swedish Church to do what the Church Universal does is the argument that she is in full communion with Lutheran bodies with no succession, and even without episcopacy of any kind. The value of this argument we shall discuss later. The denial of 'intention' is an objection which

Anglican scholars must not use without caution, for Rome employs it against themselves.

Swedish bishops are vested at their consecration with the pectoral cross and cope, and receive the pastoral staff and mitre ; Swedish priests are vested with the chasuble. It is argued by some that these ornaments have no special importance in Sweden. But it cannot be denied that the Swedish Church, by continuing the practice of episcopal consecration with the use of the ancient ornaments, intends, in a general sense, to do what the Church does. We must now consider what the Swedish Church means by a bishop.

The Swedish reformers were earnest men, who made no claim to be learned ; and they were dominated by the gigantic personality of Luther, and by the influence of the schools of Germany, just as our divines under Elizabeth were dominated by Calvin. Now Luther, in revolt against the worldliness of the German hierarchy, repudiated the necessity of apostolical succession. Emphasising the neglected doctrine of the priesthood of all believers,[1] he held that a priest should be nothing but a functionary, and that ordination is unnecessary[2] ; that ordination is not a sacrament, but a ceremony for choosing preachers in the Church, and that the clergy derive their authority from the Christian community as a whole, that is, from the State (to Luther, Church and State are one).[3] The Confession of Augsburg, which was drawn up by Melanchthon, asserts that no particular kind of organisation of the Church is necessary. (There is a sense, no doubt, in which this is true ; episcopacy is an exceedingly flexible institution, and has existed in very different forms, and the necessity of episcopacy of some kind is a matter of dogma, not of organisation.)

Moreover, all the countries round Sweden rejected the Apostolical succession. In Denmark and Norway the first reformed 'bishops' were consecrated by a simple priest ; in Protestant Germany even nominal episcopacy did not exist. It is less surprising that the Swedish Church does not insist on the necessity of episcopacy than that she has retained the succession at all, for she was the only Church in the Baltic countries that did.

---

[1] 1 Peter ii. 9.

[2] *Address to the Christian Nobility.*

[3] *Babylonish Captivity of the Church.*

In spite of all this, the Church Order of Archbishop Laurentius Petri (1571), which was confirmed by the Assembly of Upsala in 1593, says that ‘ since this ordinance (of bishops) was very useful, and without doubt proceeded from God the Holy Ghost, so it was generally approved and accepted over the whole of Christendom, and has since so remained, and must remain in the future, so long as the world lasts.’

Further, the Church of Sweden has never been forced by pressure from Rome or Geneva to fight for the maintenance of her episcopate, or to think out her reasons for having one. Practically the whole nation accepted the Reformation in one form : perhaps for the very reason that it was introduced more gradually than in any land south of the Baltic. Calvinism never got a permanent footing in the country ; Rome was only an external enemy, as there were very few Swedish ‘ recusants ’ ; even now there are only 2000 Roman Catholics, many of whom are foreigners, in a population of six millions.

Certainly the Church of Sweden has never explicitly declared that no one is validly ordained who is not ordained by a bishop. Nor has the Church of England.

But the Church of England has never officially allowed anyone not ordained by a bishop to serve in her ministry.[1] Can this be said of the Church of Sweden ?

There are seven cases, all between 1700 and 1775, of a commission granted to deans and other priests to ordain. Some of these cases were outside Sweden, and all were exceptional. None of the men so ordained became bishops. In 1786, King Gustaf III, in refusing a request from the Dean of Upsala for a similar commission to ordain, wrote : ‘ We have found that ordination belongs to bishops alone.’ A similar refusal was given in 1792 to the Bishop of Lund, who wished his dean to ordain for him : ‘ both the Church law and the dignity of such a ceremony demand that it ought to be performed by a bishop.’

But the law requiring episcopal ordination is not always observed in the mission field. As in England, the Government would not permit the consecration of bishops for the colonies in America ; and the 'Augustana Synod,' which is recognised as the 'daughter church' of the Church of Sweden for America, is Presbyterian in its government. The Church of Sweden has three missions : in South India, South China and South Africa (Natal, Zululand and Rhodesia). The Indian mission has a bishop of its own ; but the other two have no bishops, and are controlled by the Swedish Board of Missions at Upsala. The European missionaries are ordained by a bishop before sailing ; but, as far as I have been able to discover, the native pastors receive Presbyterian ordination ; hitherto the South African mission has only had one such native pastor. The total number of Swedish missionaries, clerics, laymen and women, engaged in these three missions is 130.

---

[1] For the alleged exceptions, see A. J. Mason, *Church of England and Episcopacy*.

It has often been said that the Swedish Church is in full communion with the Churches of Denmark, Norway, etc., which have no Apostolical succession. This statement seems to require qualification. All these bodies belong, historically and practically, to the Lutheran group ; but the relations between them are hardly so close as the words 'full communion' imply. There is no interchange of clergy : the civil laws do not permit it. The Swedish bishops, in their reply to the Lambeth Appeal of 1920, say that the question of terms of communion has not been much discussed among them, but their practice has been this :

1. Individual members of foreign communions[1] have never been refused permission to communicate in Sweden if they wished to do so, in case of necessity.

2. Similar permission is given, as a matter of course, to members of any communion accepting the Confession of Augsburg, while in other cases it has been thought necessary to inquire as to the faith of the communion in question. In the nineteenth century, Swedish emigrants to America were recommended to go to the Episcopal Church in places where there was no Swedish Church.

---

[1] 'Foreign communions' here means the Churches of Denmark, Norway, etc. No English bishop would refer in such terms to the American Episcopal Church !

The Swedish Church has never been forced by controversy to adopt any definite principle in these matters. Her divines have learned from Luther a hatred of any kind of 'legalism,' which is very clearly marked in the reply of the bishops quoted above. Communion in Sweden is rather infrequent, as it was among ourselves before the Oxford Movement; so that probably intercommunion does not occur often. None of these facts prove the absence of intention to continue the Apostolic Order of Bishops; and the words of Laurentius Petri are a strong argument the other way. The Church of Sweden is not bound, though no doubt she has been influenced, by the personal opinions of Luther.

The Swedish rites of consecration and ordination appear to be sufficient, though they contain some peculiarities, the chief of which is that, unlike all other ordination rites, they do not necessarily form a part of the Holy Eucharist. The objection that the Church of Sweden does not distinguish clearly between the consecration and the enthronement of a bishop, or between the ordination of a priest and the institution of a rector (for there is laying on of hands in all four rites), disappears when these rites are examined closely. The substitution of the word 'predikant' for 'prest,' from 1811 to 1894, seems to have had no doctrinal significance; the two words are said to be 'exact dictionary equivalents' (Mott Williams). In any case, it could not affect the episcopal succession.

The diaconate disappeared during the seventeenth century. (The men now called deacons are ordained with the same form as the deaconesses, for social work only. They cannot be raised to the priesthood without special permission from the King.) But according to the Western theory the priesthood includes the diaconate. Throughout Latin Christendom the diaconate is little more than a survival. Therefore the absence of the diaconate does not appear to be a matter of fundamental importance.

But to recognise the validity of Swedish Orders is not the same thing as to recognise that the Swedish Church is Catholic.

A local Church which is Catholic must have right faith, valid orders, and jurisdiction. The Church of Sweden has been shown to have valid orders. No question arises about jurisdiction because, apart from the quite modern Roman mission, there has never been any other claimant to jurisdiction in Sweden.

The objections which have been brought against the orthodoxy of the Swedish Church are these :

1. The absence of the sacrament of Confirmation.
2. Alleged defects in Eucharistic belief and rite.
3. Denial of the indissolubility of marriage.
4. Communion with Lutherans who have no episcopal succession, implying disbelief in the doctrine of Holy Orders.

1. Confirmation in its mediaeval form disappeared at the Reformation. There is evidence for confirmation by laying on of hands in some dioceses in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The modern form of ‘ confirmation ’ only dates from 1811. It consists of a public catechising with renewal of the baptismal vows. There is no laying on of hands. All priests at their ordination receive authority to confirm. Every candidate is supposed to have had forty hours of instruction before confirmation ; and the chief objection raised by the Swedish bishops against closer relations with the Anglican Churches is the inadequate preparation for confirmation among us. It is sometimes argued that laying on of hands is part of the Swedish baptismal rite. So it is ; but it precedes the baptism, and therefore cannot be identified with confirmation.

In discussing this question with Swedes we must avoid two misapprehensions :

(i) Our objection is not to the absence of confirmation by a bishop, for there is no reason in principle why priests should not be given by their bishops the power to confirm, as in the Eastern Churches, and in exceptional cases among the Latins. Our objection is to the absence of laying on of hands, or any similar ceremony, by which the gift of the Holy Ghost is bestowed, according to the practice of the Apostles.[1]

(ii) We must be careful to explain that we do not ask the Swedes to conform to Anglican practice as such. This naturally irritates them. They claim with justice that they have as much right to their customs as we have to ours. We should rather say, ' Here is a great gift of God, bestowed through the Apostles under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, and verified by the experience of Christendom through the ages. You have, through no fault of your own, lost it. We ask you to consider the matter in the light of Holy Scripture and the universal practice of the Church (including that of some of your bishops in the past), and to judge for yourselves.'

---

[1] Acts viii. 17 ; xix. 6.

2. There appears to be nothing contrary to the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist in the Swedish Liturgy or formularies, except that the celebrant is not obliged to communicate himself. The Swedish method of consecration, the reading of the narrative of the institution followed by the Lord's Prayer with intention to consecrate, must be considered by the theologians. There are other peculiarities, but not much greater than those of our own rite. The beliefs of individuals are no business of ours. As long as the variety of Eucharistic belief among ourselves is so great, we have no right to be particular.

3. Every Church which is closely connected with the State finds the greatest difficulty in maintaining the indissolubility of marriage. In the Eastern Churches, as is well known, the standards of the Byzantine Empire have to some extent been accepted. In Western Europe before the Reformation the indissolubility of marriage was only preserved in theory by the practice of declaring marriages null and void for a great number of causes. Luther and other reformers held that divorce itself was better than such a system. The close connection between the Swedish Church and the State, and the fact that nearly everyone in Sweden, whatever his belief or practice, nominally belongs to the Church and is married with her rite, makes this question extremely difficult. Still the Swedish marriage service implies that marriage is to last till death, though not so emphatically as the Anglican rite, which seems to show that the Church does not deny the Scriptural and Catholic doctrine that marriage is indissoluble, though her

connection with the State makes her unable to maintain it in practice. It should, however, be made clear that any Swedes who accept the privilege of communion at Anglican altars must be living in accordance with the Anglican rule; which is, that no party to a marriage, in which either of the couple has a living, but divorced, husband or wife, can be admitted to communion.

4. We have already discussed the relations between the Swedish Church and other Lutheran bodies. No doubt these relations are at present a barrier to complete reunion: but for this we are not yet ready. And it is possible that the Swedish Church may be able to persuade some of the other Baltic national Churches to share her gift of the succession.

The seven bishoprics of mediaeval Sweden have been increased since the Reformation. Gustaf Vasa founded the see of Viborg in Finland; at present there are five dioceses in Finland—Åbo, Tammerfors, Viborg, Kuopio, and Borga. The Finnish Church was separated from that of Sweden in 1814, when the country was annexed by Russia, and Åbo became an archbishopric. The succession was unfortunately lost in 1885. All the Finnish bishops died within a short time, and the Emperor Alexander III would not allow the succession to be renewed from Sweden, but ordered the Dean of Åbo to 'consecrate' the new bishops. He was unwilling to do so, but he obeyed.

On the other hand, the see of Lund, which had originally been the see of the Primate of all Scandinavia, became a Swedish bishopric when the Province of Scania was taken from Denmark in 1658. The following new sees have been founded since the Reformation: Göteborg, Kalmar, Karlstad, Visby, Hernösand, and Luleå. Bishop Tottie, who visited England during the Lambeth Conference of 1908, as the representative of the Church of Sweden, was the last Bishop of Kalmar; the see was united with Vexiö when Luleå was founded.

To-day the Swedish Church consists of the archbishopric of Upsala and eleven bishoprics: six mediaeval and five modern. In recent years the episcopate has been extended to other countries. The Tamil Lutheran Church of South India, a self-governing Church served by Swedish Church missionaries, is presided over by the Bishop of Tranquebar, who resides at Trinchinopoly. He was consecrated in India by the present Bishop of Lund. The Archbishop of Upsala has consecrated two bishops for Latvia, one for Estonia, and one for Slovakia. So there are at present seventeen bishops of the Swedish succession.

A Swedish bishop is appointed in the following manner. The chapter of the diocese, which consists of the dean, the treasurer of the cathedral, and the professors of the school in the cathedral city, whether clerics or laymen, elects three candidates, whose names are sent to the King, and he may choose any of them. At Upsala and Lund (the two university cities) the professors of the theological faculties are members of the chapter ; at Göteborg, the rectors of the Swedish and (so-called) German churches. In the case of the archbishopric, the members of all the chapters throughout the country have the right to vote. The consecration by the bishops then follows.

The Swedish dioceses are large in area, and the bishops have a great deal to do. Administration and discipline are the work of the bishop and chapter, who meet every week. All ordinations are, of course, performed by the bishop. He does not confirm, but he carries out a visitation of every parish in his diocese about once in ten years. This visitation lasts several days, and includes a thorough investigation of the whole spiritual, social and financial condition of the Church in that place. Sweden is not thickly populated ; the bulk of the people live in the country, and the country parish is usually much larger, both in area and in population, than is common in England. The connection between Church and State is closer than in any other European country ; for instance, there are no civil registrars : all registration of births, deaths, vaccination, change of address, etc., is done by the clergy. Every year a series of texts for all the Sundays is officially issued, and all the clergy throughout the country must preach on the text for the day.

There are many survivals from the Middle Ages in Swedish life. In the south-west, we are told, the bulk of the people go to confession four times a year. The cathedrals and old churches throughout the country contain mediaeval ornaments, vestments and plate. Holy wells are still frequented by the country people. The old national costumes are often seen, especially in certain provinces.

To conclude: the validity of Swedish ordinations must be accepted, not only because it has been recognised by the Anglican bishops, but because all the objections to it can be shown to be insufficient; which means that a Swedish priest who wished to serve in the Anglican Communion would not have to be ordained. (There have been several cases in America of Swedish priests received in their Orders.) We cannot justly accuse the Swedish Church of heresy or schism, but we do think that her lack of the Sacrament of Confirmation, and her laxity as to the necessity of episcopal ordination in the mission field, and in allied communions, constitute at present a barrier to complete reunion which, both for the sake of our own internal discipline and for the sake of our relations with other Churches, we cannot ignore. But we must not take up a superior attitude; the Swedish Church is quite as well able to judge for herself as we are, and she will not restore these things until she is convinced that she needs them. In the meantime there is no pressing need for closer official relations than at present exist: but there is need for much closer mutual knowledge, sympathy and love between the Swedish and the Anglican Churches, especially those members of the Anglican Churches who emphasise their Catholic heritage.

For Further Study

'National Church of Sweden.' By Bishop John Wordsworth. The best book on the subject in any language. (A. R. Mowbray.)

'The Church of Sweden and the Anglican Communion.' By Bishop G. Mott Williams. (A. R. Mowbray.)

'Report of the Commission of the Lambeth Conference of 1908 on Swedish Orders.' (A. R. Mowbray.)

'Documents on Christian Unity, 1920–24.' Edited by G. K. A. Bell, Bishop of Chichester. 'Reply of the Swedish Bishops to the Lambeth Appeal.' Pp. 185–195. (Oxford University Press.)

VIII

EPISCOPACY IN THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCHES

By C. B. Moss

The Old Catholic Churches are seven small self-governing national Churches in communion with the ancient see of Utrecht, which was founded by St. Willibrord, a missionary bishop from Yorkshire, in 696. In the Netherlands, as in the rest of Northern Europe, there were in the later Middle Ages too few bishops, and out of those few many had become great secular princes. The bishops had become remote from the ordinary life of the people, and this corruption of the episcopal system was one of the main causes of the Reformation. Bishops had so long neglected their real duties that the reformers could see no value in episcopacy. Up to 1560 there was only one bishop in the territory now called Holland, and that one had been until 1528 a 'prince-bishop' with secular sovereignty, usually performing his spiritual duties by deputy.

In 1560 Philip II had Utrecht raised to an archbishopric, with five bishoprics under it, of which only Haarlem and Deventer need be mentioned. But this precipitated the catastrophe, for the new bishops were regarded as instruments for the introduction of the Spanish Inquisition. All the bishoprics, except Utrecht, disappeared in the Calvinist revolution. For more than a century the Roman Catholics of Holland lived under persecution; the Archbishop of Utrecht could only appear in Holland under the assumed style of a 'bishop *in partibus*.' The Chapter of Utrecht survived, elected the archbishops according to the canons, and administered the diocese in the archbishop's absence, and during the vacancy of the see.

During the seventeenth century the Jesuits did their utmost to put an end to the archbishopric. They wished to obtain entire control of the Catholic Church in Holland, and to work it as a mission under the Congregation of Propaganda. To this the Archbishop, the Chapter and the secular clergy were strongly opposed, and in 1609 Archbishop Vosmeer refused to allow the Jesuits to work in his diocese. The struggle became extended to the region of doctrine and morals. The archbishops and their clergy were followers of St. Augustine and sympathised with the party called by its opponents 'Jansenist' after Cornelius Jansen, Bishop of Ypres (died 1638). They accused the Jesuits of dangerous laxity in their moral teaching, of building up a system of casuistry most injurious to souls, and of minimising the need of divine grace.

The quarrel became an open schism when Archbishop Peter Codde (1669–1710) was summoned to Rome and in 1701 deprived of his see, without any opportunity of defending himself, and a nominee of the Jesuits was sent to govern the Roman Catholics of Holland. The Chapter of Utrecht declared that this was an invasion of their canonical right to elect their archbishop; and they were supported by two-thirds of the Dutch Catholic clergy and people. For twenty years there was no bishop in Holland, and the Chapter had great difficulty in obtaining confirmation and ordination for Dutch candidates. At last, in 1723, Cornelius Steenoven was elected Archbishop, and consecrated in the following year by Dominic Varlet, Bishop of Babylon. Varlet was a French missionary bishop who, while passing through Amsterdam on his way to his work in Persia, confirmed some candidates for the Chapter of Utrecht. On his arrival in Persia he found himself suspended. This suspension was uncanonical as he had not been tried, and it was afterwards admitted by canonists of all schools to be null and void. He returned to Amsterdam, and, with the approval of the Universities of Paris and Louvain, consecrated Steenoven to be Archbishop of Utrecht on October 15, 1724. Congratulations were received from many bishops in

France and other countries, but the Pope excommunicated everyone connected with the consecration.

The three successors of Steenoven were all consecrated by Varlet, but after his death in 1742 it was necessary to restore the sees of Haarlem and Deventer in order that the succession might be preserved. These three sees still exist; Deventer has always been merely a titular see, but Utrecht and Haarlem are properly constituted dioceses. The succession has several times depended on a single life, but it has never been lost, and the validity of orders given by bishops of the Utrecht succession is recognised by Rome.

The Dutch bishops and their flocks were still Roman Catholics. They had changed nothing in doctrine, discipline, or ritual. As late as 1763 Archbishop Meindaerts received letters of communion from many bishops in France, Spain, Germany, and even Italy. Various attempts at reconciliation were made, but they were always wrecked on two points. The Dutch bishops could not accept the Bull *Unigenitus* of 1713, which had no conciliar authority behind it, and which they did not believe to be true; and they would not admit that the 'Five Propositions,' which they recognised to be false and heretical, were to be found in Jansen's writings. Meanwhile the number of their adherents was declining. By the middle of the nineteenth century it was little more than 5000 (since increased to more than 10,000).

The whole situation was changed by the Vatican Council of 1870, to which the Dutch 'schismatic' bishops (for the Pope had set up a rival hierarchy in Holland in 1853) were not even invited. The Roman Catholics in Germany and Switzerland who could not accept the new dogmas by the Council, and were therefore excommunicated, were forced to organise their religious life in independence of Rome. Joseph Hubert Reinkens, the first German Old Catholic Bishop, was consecrated at Rotterdam by Herman Heykamp, Bishop of Deventer, the only surviving bishop of the Utrecht succession, on August 11, 1873.

Since then Old Catholic bishops have been consecrated for Switzerland, Czecho-Slovakia, Austria, Croatia, and for the Poles, first in the United States and then in Poland itself. The justification for the consecration of these bishops, in countries in which an episcopate already exists, is that the existing bishops cannot minister to those who reject the dogmas of the infallibility and universal ordinary jurisdiction of the Pope.

In 1889 the five Old Catholic bishops of Holland, Germany and Switzerland agreed to the 'Declaration of Utrecht.' This declaration of principles is the doctrinal basis of the Old Catholic Churches. Every Old Catholic bishop accepts the Declaration of Utrecht at his consecration, and promises not to consecrate anyone to the episcopate without the consent of the other Old Catholic bishops.

It is only in Holland that Old Catholic bishops have territorial titles. In other countries they are 'regionary bishops,' making no claim to jurisdiction beyond their own flocks.

The total number of Old Catholic bishops at the time of writing (1929) is fourteen. Their names are as follows :

Francis Kenninck, Archbishop of Utrecht.
Henry John Theodore van Vlymen, Bishop of Haarlem.
John Herman Berends, Bishop of Deventer.
George Moog, Bishop in Germany.
Adolf Küry, Bishop in Switzerland.
Alois Paschek, Bishop in Czecho-Slovakia.
Robert Tüchler, Bishop in Austria.
Marko Kalogjera, Bishop in Croatia.
Francis Hodur, Primate of the National Polish Church in America.

Valentine Gawrychowski	Bishops of the National Polish Church in America.
Francis Bonczak	
Leon Grochowski	
John Zenon Jazinski	
W. H. Faron	Bishop in Poland.

The functions of an Old Catholic bishop are the same as those of any other bishop in Western Christendom. He is elected by the clergy and representatives of the laity of his diocese, and the election requires, in some countries, the assent of the Government. Each national Church is governed by its own constitution. There are two types of constitution: that of the German and Czecho-Slovak Old Catholic Churches, in which the bishop has considerable powers, and that of the Swiss and Austrian Old Catholic Churches, which is more democratic.

All Old Catholic bishops are allowed to marry, even after consecration.

There is no Old Catholic Church without a bishop. The only Old Catholic parish in France is under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Utrecht. For many years the Austrian Government forbade the consecration of an Old Catholic bishop, but Amandus Cech, the bishop-elect, performed all the functions of a bishop, except of course the administration of confirmation and ordination.

Decisions affecting the whole Old Catholic communion are made by the Bishops' Conference, which meets about every three years at the time of the International Old Catholic Conference. They are then sent to the Synods of the different Churches for approval or rejection. The validity of Anglican Orders had already been accepted by all the different Churches before it was accepted by the Bishops' Conference at Berne in 1925.

The Old Catholic Ordinal is identical with that of the Roman Church. The words 'Accipe Sanctum Spiritum,' etc., are usually said in Latin at the consecration of bishops. Otherwise all Old Catholic services are in the language of the country.

Old Catholic candidates for ordination are trained at the Seminary at Amersfoort, now two centuries old, and at the Old Catholic theological faculties in the Universities of Bonn and Berne. The intellectual standard is high: in Switzerland, at least, knowledge of Hebrew as well as Greek and Latin is required.

The doctrinal and ecclesiastical orthodoxy of the Old Catholic Churches is not open to question, except from the Roman point of view. They have set aside the authority of all Councils held since the schism between Rome and Constantinople, including those of Trent and the Vatican, and have taken their stand on the canon of St. Vincent of Lerins and the teaching of the undivided Church. The

Old Catholic Church of Holland is, in spite of its small size, the canonical representative of the mediaeval see of Utrecht. The other Old Catholic bishops are regionary bishops consecrated to minister to those Catholics who have been excommunicated for refusing to accept the new dogmas imposed by the Vatican Council.

The relation between the Old Catholic and Anglican Churches is this. The Lambeth Conferences since 1888 have recommended that Old Catholics separated from the ministry of their own clergy may be admitted to communion in Anglican churches. The Old Catholics have granted the same privilege to Anglicans, in Germany actually by canon. Only in Holland an Anglican seeking communion in an Old Catholic church is examined as to his orthodoxy, especially as to the Eucharist. Moreover, in Holland communion is still given in one kind only in most parishes. There is no real doctrinal issue between the two communions, and it is to be hoped that the restoration of complete intercommunion will not be long delayed.

It is unfortunately necessary to say a few words about the various sects which claim to have received episcopal succession from the Old Catholic Church of Holland.

In 1908, Arnold Harris Mathew, an ex-Roman Catholic priest, persuaded Archbishop Gul and the other Dutch bishops to consecrate him as an Old Catholic bishop for England. He stated that fifteen Roman Catholic congregations in England, with their priests, wished to become Old Catholic. This statement turned out to be untrue.

Two years later Bishop Mathew severed his connexion with the Old Catholics and consecrated two Roman Catholic priests to the episcopate. (These two priests afterwards submitted, one to Rome, the other to Canterbury.) The Old Catholic bishops excommunicated Bishop Mathew, and declared that, since he had obtained consecration by falsehood, they would not recognise the validity of any ordinations or consecrations performed by him.

The Lambeth Conference of 1920, after a thorough investigation of all the facts, recommended that if anyone ordained by Bishop Mathew or his successors wished to be admitted to the Anglican ministry, and were considered suitable, he should be ordained 'sub conditione.' This is the present Anglican practice.

Bishop Mathew, now completely isolated, consecrated a large number of persons, few of whom seem to have had any special qualifications for the episcopal office. The circumstances of these consecrations are somewhat obscure, and the gravest doubts have been entertained as to their validity. It is through one such consecration that the 'Liberal Catholics' and other theosophical sects claim to derive their succession. It is, however, quite certain that the 'Liberal Catholics' have no belief in sacraments or orders in the Christian sense, or indeed in any of the fundamental Christian doctrines; and therefore that their claim to 'orders' or 'succession' is one that no Christian Church accepts, or could accept, for a moment, any more than the similar claims made by the Gnostics in the second century.

The real successor of Bishop Mathew is Archbishop Bernard Williams, who presides over a very small body called the 'Old Roman Catholics.' They have no other bishops in the British Isles, but four elsewhere, probably in America. Their doctrine is difficult to distinguish from that of Rome.

Besides Bishop Mathew, the Old Catholic bishops also consecrated in 1909 three bishops for the Mariaviten community in Poland, which had been received into their communion. During the war this Church fell into certain errors, which are attributed to war neurosis, and it was afterwards excommunicated by the Old Catholic bishops. As far as the writer knows, no further Mariaviten bishops have been consecrated.

The strange career of Bishop Mathew raises the question whether the Church is bound to recognise a completely or almost completely isolated individual as a bishop capable of conferring orders. The theory that anyone consecrated by a bishop in the usual manner, even though a heretic or schismatic, is necessarily a bishop, which has been a commonplace in the West since the time of St. Augustine, seems to have been devised for the purpose of reconciling the Donatists. But when pressed as far as it has been by some modern claimants to episcopal status it becomes an absurdity. A bishop is an officer of the Church ; even the Donatist bishops were officers of the Donatist Church. But must a man be regarded as a bishop if he is completely isolated or supported by a mere handful of his own disciples ? The traditional Western theory was never intended to meet such a situation. It seems reasonable to fall back on the Eastern theory that the Church *may*, in certain conditions, recognise the orders or sacraments of non-Catholics by the exercise of what is called ' economy,' but she is not bound to do so. No non-Catholic has a right to say to the Church, ' I am a bishop, or a priest, and you are bound to recognise my orders ' ; for it is only as an act of grace that the Church recognises any non-Catholic ministries at all. The Anglican Communion, in refusing to recognise the ordinations of Bishop Mathew and other ' wandering bishops,' appears to have departed from the Western theory and fallen back on the Eastern, which it had a perfect right to do.

Books for Further Study.

Old Catholic Churches.

J. M. Neale : ' History of the (so-called) Jansenist Church in Holland.' (1858.)

C. B. Moss : ' Old Catholic Churches and Reunion.' (S.P.C.K. 1927.)

Mathewites.

A. H. Mathew : ' An Episcopal Odyssey.'

Recognition of Non-Catholic Orders.

H. B. Swete : ' Essays on the Early History of the Church and Ministry.' (Macmillan, 1918.)

O. C. Quick : ' The Christian Sacraments.'

J. A. Douglas : ' Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern Orthodox.' (Faith Press.)

IX

THE CONTINUITY OF THE MINISTRY IN SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIANISM AND IN METHODISM, ENGLISH AND AMERICAN, WITH AN APPENDED NOTE ON THE MORAVIAN SUCCESSION

By H. N. Bate

In the following essay an attempt is made to consider the Presbyterian and Methodist ministries, not, indeed, in respect of their effectiveness, but simply in relation to the notion of continuity—that is, to that mark of the Church which in other communions the Episcopate is thought to have conserved. It will be seen that there is sufficient affinity between these two great Christian families to warrant their being grouped together for this limited purpose.

The constitutive principles recognised as differentiating the Presbyterian churches from others are, according to Dr. Moffatt,[1] (*a*) the parity of presbyters ; (*b*) the right of the people, through their representatives or lay elders, to take part in the government of the Church ; and (*c*) the unity of the Church, not simply in faith and order, but in a graduated series of Church Courts which express and exercise the common authority of the Church as a Divine Society.

It is with the first of these principles that we are chiefly concerned here. The others have been and are of vital importance to the closely welded life and discipline of Presbyterian bodies ; in their working, indeed, they have given to those Churches a coherence, and to their members a sense of duty and privilege, which other communities can only regard with respectful envy. But although they belong to the *esse* of Presbyterianism, and differentiate it in principle from Independency, they could not be regarded, from a Catholic point of view, as marks of separateness; they are indeed modes in which Presbyterianism expresses and effectively realises a Catholic ideal. 'The parity of Presbyters,' on the other hand, is a principle by which Presbyterianism, together with many other systems, is differentiated from the main stream of Christian tradition. It involves, for Presbyterians, both less and more than the words imply: less, for in Presbyterian order there are in fact two types of presbyter, both of them ordained, but one of them clerical and the other lay; both holding membership in the presbytery, but with differing functions, the lay elder not being authorised to ordain; and more, since the principle of 'parity' includes the negative rule that the Church recognises, and since the last Apostle died has recognised, no order higher than that of presbyter.

---

[1] *The Presbyterian Churches*, p. 2.

But while this negation is common ground between Presbyterians and many other types of Protestant order, Presbyterianism is marked off, *e.g.* from Independency in all its forms, by the strong emphasis which it lays upon the due transmission of authority. Hence there are Presbyterian teachers of weight, in Scotland at least, in whose judgment the *esse* of Presbyterianism depends not simply on the parity of presbyters, nor on any system of disciplinary organisation, but on the reality of the presbyterate as a ministry duly transmitted.[1]

Presbyterian authorities would no doubt be found to differ in their estimate of the principle of ministerial succession. But the facts of Presbyterian practice, and the rule on which they rest, have been clear and unvarying at least since the early decades of the seventeenth century. The 'Form of Presbyterial Church Government,' approved by the Scottish General Assembly in 1645, establishes alike the share of the laity in approving a minister's vocation, and the limitation of the ordaining act to a definite order: 'Every minister of the Word is to be ordained by imposition of hands, and prayer, with fasting, by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong.' Thus the issue to be considered here narrows down to a single point. Presbyterianism adheres, alike in principle and in practice, to the Catholic requirement that ministerial authority shall be duly transmitted ; its *differentia* is that it combines with this a certain theory of the functions of the presbyteral order.

---

[1] See, *e.g.*, Dr. Wotherspoon's *Presbyterian Orders.*

The story of the Reformed movement in Scotland divides itself into six well-marked stages. There is an initial period which we may link with the name and achievements of John Knox ; this is followed by a brief stage of consolidation, in which Andrew Melville is a dominant figure ; then follows the gradual reintroduction of Episcopacy under James VI and I, culminating in the 'experiment of 1610' and the relatively tranquil period which followed it; after this comes the violent and destructive reaction provoked by the policy of Charles I, and the total suppression of Episcopacy in 1638. In 1661 we have another complete reversal of policy, with a second Episcopacy, lasting, with a sinister background of fanatical resistance and iniquitous persecution, through the reigns of Charles II and James II ; and lastly, with the arrival of a Presbyterian from Holland to occupy the throne of both Kingdoms, we have the restoration of the ministers 'outed' in 1661, and that definitive establishment of Presbyterianism which persists to the present day.

We are not directly concerned here with the drama of the Covenants or the tragedy of the 'killing-times.' The ministry which the Church of Scotland now possesses goes back to 1661 ; it was this ministry, dating from the revolution under Charles I and the period preceding it, which was restored when Episcopacy went out into the wilderness under Dutch William, and it is in virtue of this ministry that Scottish Presbyterianism claims [1] to possess a '*perpetua successio presbyterorum* from before the Reformation.'

Our study of the claim can be narrowed down still further. On the one hand it reduces itself, as a problem of Church order, to the question whether a *perpetua successio presbyterorum* is admissible in theory ; and on the other, as a problem of Reformation history, it presents itself in the two-fold form: (*a*) Was the ministry, as consolidated after Knox' death, a legitimate successor to the unreformed hierarchy? and (*b*) Did the ministry of 1638, after the Jacobean episcopate and its destruction under Charles I, provide such a link with the past that its inheritors may be regarded as possessing a valid presbyterate? These two historical questions have indeed no final relevance unless the anterior question of Church order can be answered in the affirmative; but for the moment we may suspend judgment at that point in order to look at the historical difficulties without prejudice.

---

[1] Lord Balfour of Burleigh, *The Rise and Development of Presbyterianism in Scotland*, p. 44.

Down to the death of Knox in 1572, the Reforming movement in Scotland, deeply involved at all points with political interests, had not assumed permanent form. We may regard the 'Second Book of Discipline,' finally ratified by the General Assembly in 1581, and endorsed in substance by the State in 1592, as the monument of Presbyterianism as a settled order. For the formative period preceding this short-lived but ultimately definitive settlement we have to look to the writings of Knox, the Scots 'Confession' and the 'First Book of Discipline' as representing the main ideas and ideals of the reforming party. It was in 1560 that the 'Confession' and the 'Book of Discipline' appeared, at the moment when the Estates, without endorsing any new formal standards for the Church, committed themselves to the Reformed faith, abolished the papal jurisdiction in Scotland, and suppressed the Mass. The relevant documents belong then to a time of drastic revolution; and it is with a drastic renewal of the Church that they are concerned. When the whole existing fabric of Church life was to be swept away, when a hierarchy strangely corrupt, as it seems, and a clergy deeply illiterate were soon to efface themselves with surprising suddenness, when the whole conception of religious teaching was to be revised from its foundations, what room, one may ask, was likely to be found for any thought of continuity? It would hardly be surprising if, at such a moment of upheaval, men's minds had welcomed rather the thought of a complete rebuilding of the Church from a totally new beginning.

Yet neither in Scotland nor in Geneva, nor indeed anywhere, was the claim made that the Christian Society had ceased to exist and must be constituted anew. The 'Confession of Faith' asserts [1] that 'from the beginning thair has been, now is, and to the end of the warld shalbe a Churche, which Churche is Catholike, because it includes the elect of all ages, realmes, natiouns and tongues.' This true Church has from the beginning until now subsisted side by side with a synagogue of Satan, the company of Cain, Ishmael and Caiaphas, embodied now in 'that horrible harlot the Kirk Malignant.' John Knox, in a controversial letter,[2] maintains that the true Church is now represented in rightful succession by the fellowship of the Reformers. 'We are able to shew the succession of our Kirk directly and lawfully to have flowed from the Apostles. And our reason is because that in our Kirk we neither admit doctrine, rite nor ceremony, which by their writings we find not authorised.'

The purpose therefore of the Reforming party at this stage was the re-edification of a Church already and always existent, but not as yet made manifest in outward order. Nothing was held to be requisite for this beyond the three notes of the true Kirk, namely, the true preaching of the Word of God, the right administration of the sacraments of Christ Jesus, and an ecclesiastical discipline rightly administered. At all points there was to be a clean severance between the true Kirk, thus restored, and the Kirk Malignant. The immaculate spouse of Christ Jesus possessed its own titles of authority; but these included 'neither antiquity, title usurped, lineal descent, place appointed, nor multitude of men approving one error [3]; the true Kirk must flee the society with the papistical, in participation of their sacraments,' and must renounce its ministry, on the ground that 'their ministers are no ministers of Christ Jesus, and they have so adulterat both the one Sacrament and the other that no part of Christ's action abideth in the original purity.' In place of that ministry the true Kirk requires lawful ministers of the Sacraments, 'whom we affirm to be only they that are appointed to the preaching of the word, or into whose mouths God had put some sermon or exhortation, they being men lawfully chosen thereto by some Kirk.'[1]

---

[1] Knox, *Works*, vol. ii. pp. 108 ff. (Bannatyne Society).

[2] 'Letter to Tyrie the Jesuit,' in Knox, *Works*, vol. vi. chap. ii. pp. 485 ff.

[3] 'Confession of Faith' in Knox, *Works*, ut sup., pp. 109 ff.

Knox[2] describes the steps which were taken in the early days of the Reforming movement to provide such a ministry: 'Before there was any public face of a true religion within this realm . . . private persons gathered together . . . and because variety of persons could not be kept in good obedience . . . without over-seers, elders and deacons; so began that small flock to put themselves in such order as if Christ Jesus had plainly triumphed in the midst of them . . . and they did elect some to occupy the supreme place of exhortation and reading, some to be elders and helpers unto them for the oversight of the flock, and some to be deacons for the collection of alms. Of this small beginning is that order which now God . . . has given unto us publicly within this realm.'

It seems clear from this picture that the atmosphere of the Knoxian period was not one in which any scruples about the continuity of the ministerial office were likely to modify the process of reform. And when we turn to the 'Book of Discipline,' we perceive that at this point the repudiation of tradition was complete. The ministry contemplated and organised in 1560 was intended to be a 'lawful' one; but 'lawfulness' was determined by three *criteria* alone, election, examination and admission, these three processes combining to constitute 'ordinary vocation.' 'Admission,' it is said, 'must consist in consent of the people and Kirk where-to they are appointed, and in approbation of the learned Ministers appointed for their examination'; no room is left for ordination, and still less is there any suggestion that a previous ordination, in the case of men already in priests' orders, is of any significance. 'Other ceremony than the public approbation of the people and declaration of the chief minister that the person there presented is appointed to serve that kirk, we cannot approve; for albeit the Apostles used the imposition of hands, yet seeing the miracle is ceased, the using of the ceremony we judge is not necessary.' [1] When this declaration is taken together with the repudiation of ' lineal descente ' (*successio episcoporum* in the Latin version) as a mark of the Church, it becomes clear that nascent Presbyterianism refused to recognise ordination as a conferring of gifts of the Holy Spirit, or as possessing more than local significance ; in each case the admission of a Minister ' to serve that Kirk ' was all that was intended.

---

[1] *Ibid.* p. 115.

[2] *Works*, vol. ii. pp. 151 ff.

The teaching of Calvin was less radical, in some points, than that of Knox, although the latter and his friends incorporated in their earliest public documents all the essential points of the Calvinist theory of the Church. Their practice as to the Ministry, in particular, goes beyond Calvin altogether. Calvin attached a real importance to ordination. He definitely repudiated that view, general now among Congregationalists and held by some Presbyterians,[2] which reduces it to the recognition of a previous call ; he held that St. Paul was actually ordained at Antioch, and he interpreted 1 Tim. iv. 14 as meaning that Paul ordained Timothy ' by the laying-on of hands for the presbyterate.' Further, he included a ceremony among the elements required for the due constitution of a man as minister. The Church, he taught, must presuppose the inward calling of an ordinand ; it is the outward calling which belongs to its public order, and a legitimate choosing by competent persons should be followed by the imposition of hands. This ceremony, ' though never expressly enjoined, was so constant that it should have for us the force of a precept, as recommending to the people the dignity of the ministry and as reminding the ordained that he is no longer his own master. Yet it should be kept free from superstition.'

The Knoxian way of avoiding superstition was the suspension of the suspected ceremony ; and it seems possible that in Scotland, at the outset, the common Reformed negation of Episcopacy was carried a step further than Calvin would have actually approved. On the other hand, we now find it argued[1] that the witness of the 'Confession' is ambiguous and that of the 'First Book of Discipline' irrelevant; that the former does not formally renounce the idea of ministerial succession, and that the latter never possessed the authority of the Church. The reason why the 'Book of Discipline' sheds little light on what was thought about the act of ordination is, we are told,[2] that the practical question in 1561 'was not the ordination of new ministers, but the terms on which men already in Orders should be accepted as ministers of the Reformed Kirk.'

---

[1] Knox, *Works*, vol. ii. p. 193.

[2] Carnegie Simpson, *Church Principles*, pp. 74 f.

The facts here in dispute are probably incapable of being fully determined. It is asserted that there were some cases of ordination by laying-on of hands before 1572[3]; and on the other side there appears to be evidence that even after 1581 the rule of such ordination was not rigidly followed: 'Melville was never thus ordained; Robert Bruce exercised his ministry for eleven years before ordination; and as late as 1597 the General Assembly had to reiterate the necessity in all cases of ordination by the laying-on of hands.'[4] There is no doubt that the apologists of Presbyterianism, from Thomas Smeton (1599) onwards, were unanimous in holding, at least as an *argumentum ad hominem*, that the 'ordinarie calling' of the earlier Reformers rested upon their possession of Roman orders; but it is difficult to believe that this conception was present to the minds of those who framed the inchoate polity of 1561. What could have been simpler for them, had they desired merely to assert the sufficiency of Roman orders without any added rite, than to say that ordination is needless for those already ordained? But their actual language suggests rather that they were conscious of looking forward, of substituting a new method of authorisation for the old rite with the implications of an imparted gift, and of radically revising the hitherto received notion of ministerial succession.

---

[1] *E.g.* by Dr. Wotherspoon, *Presbyterian Orders* (Scottish Church Society Occasional Papers, IV.), and *Doctrine and Law of the Church as to Ordination* (Edinburgh, 1909).

[2] *Presbyterian Orders*, p. 13.

[3] Dr. Wotherspoon (*Presbyterian Orders*, p. 14) cites that of Morrison, licensed by Archbishop Grindal, as having been 'admitted and ordained to sacred orders and the holy Ministry by the imposition of hands according to the laudable form and rite of the Reformed Church of Scotland.' But this license was granted in 1581, and states that Morrison had been ordained 'about five years past,' *i.e.* in 1575 at the earliest. The full text is given in Strype, *Life and Acts of Edmund Grindal*, pp. 402 f.

[4] Selwyn, *The First Book of the Irenicum of John Forbes of Corse*, p. 6.

But in 1567 the General Assembly formally approved the Second Helvetic Confession, which requires that after lawful call and choice, ministers shall be 'ordained by the presbyters with public prayer and the laying-on of hands'[1]; and ten years later the 'Second Book of Discipline' definitely prescribed 'fasting, prayer, and the laying-on of hands of the eldership' as 'the ceremony of ordination.'

At this point, without question, we pass to firm ground. From 1577 onwards there is no variation in Presbyterian practice or principle with regard to the transmission of ministerial authority. When the Westminster Assembly declared that 'every minister of the Word is to be ordained by imposition of hands and prayer with fasting by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong,' it asserted principles to which Presbyterians north of the border had adhered for nearly three-quarters of a century, which they reaffirmed finally after the Revolution of 1689, and have never since abandoned.

The consolidation of Presbyterianism, which attained completeness in the last decade of the sixteenth century, was followed in the seventeenth by three epochs of change and resettlement. Episcopacy, restored in 1610, demolished in 1638, was reintroduced in 1661 and persisted till 1690. For the real understanding of Scottish Churchmanship, Episcopal or Presbyterian, and of the motives which have sustained alike the dominant legions on the one side and the indomitable remnant on the other, the four Stuart reigns which this period covers are all-important. But in relation to the single narrow thread which we have here to follow, there is much less material for discussion in the record of those momentous times than one would expect. We are considering only the mode in which the form of Presbyterianism conceives itself to have preserved a legitimate ministry. With this point in view, we may write off the whole interval between 1661 and 1689, which the settlement under William of Orange annulled at one stroke when it based the ministry for the future on the survivors of the period preceding Charles II's return. To these sixty ministers, and those whom they should associate with them, was committed the task of governing and purging the Church ; and while the large number of those Episcopalian clergy who were ' rabbled,' or deprived as non-jurors, was partially balanced by the odd hundred who were suffered to remain in their cures, those who remained in possession stayed on merely as conforming Dissenters, and the character of the ministry was determined thenceforward by principles wholly non-episcopal. But as for the sixty survivors of the ministry outed in 1661, it is obvious that, on actuarial probabilities, only a very few of these can have derived their orders from the epoch which came to an end in 1638. If we take twenty-four as an average age for ordination, the youngest of the sixty must have been fifty-three years old at the time of his restoration, and only those who were over seventy-six can have been ordained under the First Episcopacy.

---

[1] An ordinal was adopted in 1570, which probably conformed to this injunction. It seems to have been used in 1572 at the consecration of a bishop by three presbyters (Wotherspoon, *Doctrine and Law*, ut sup., p. 7).

The shadow, but not the substance, of Episcopacy was introduced into the Kirk in 1572, and by 1606 James was able to fill out this *simulacrum* by grants of jurisdiction which tended to bring the Presbyterians under episcopal control. It was not till 1610 that this strange business culminated in the consecration of Spottiswoode and two others (by English bishops), and subsequently of the remaining Scottish holders of the episcopal title. From 1610 till 1638 Scotland possessed an episcopate whose technical validity was open to no more serious criticism, from an Anglican standpoint, than that Spottiswoode and his colleagues, unless their previous ordination is held to have made them genuine presbyters, must be held to have been consecrated *per saltum.*

The changes of 1610 interfered in no way with the status of the existing parochial ministers, who continued to serve their cures without reordination. During the twenty-eight succeeding years it seems that ordination in all normal cases was restricted to the bishops ; by 1638, therefore, a large proportion of the Scottish clergy must have possessed orders so conferred. What happened in 1610 was to a large extent repeated after 1661, when care was taken that no suggestion of irregularity should attach to the bishops, and none of them was consecrated *per saltum*. 'None of the bishops' at that time 'except Bishop Mitchell insisted on reordaining ministers who had received only Presbyterian ordination, though they did not refuse to do so when asked.'[1] The policy of 1662 may indeed have been 'an attempt to force patronage, Erastianism and Episcopacy on a generation which had been brought up to believe in the injustice of the first, and the iniquity of the other two,' [2] but though it resulted in many ejections—Mathieson reckons the number at 271—it left the question of orders as it found it.

Had either James I or Charles I understood how to respect and build upon the passion for ordered spiritual liberty which was now taking such deep root in the Scottish character, the settlement of 1610 might have endured to this day. It was founded in part upon common sense; moral, religious and social causes were at work which made it doubtful whether a regimen of presbyters alone could result in stable peace. The presbyteries needed the steadying influence of a permanent headship; the parliament needed the presence of ecclesiastics who could hold Kirk and State together; the nation needed a power which could stand out against the rapacity of the nobles; hag-ridden with the fear of witchcraft, and apt to be inflamed by wild teaching in the parishes, the common folk needed wise men in high places. The First Episcopacy supplied these needs. It was not in the old sense prelatical; working together with presbyters or kirk-sessions, it afforded an admirable type of constitutional church government. It gave the Kirk a new spirit in theology, a succession of deeply learned scholars, and some noble examples of piety and devotion; its collapse after less than thirty years was due to no inherent defect, but only to the unhappy limitations of the Stuart who stumbled into it and of his tragic successor.

---

[1] Grub, *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, chap. lxiv., quoting Mover, *Short Account*, pp. 59–64; Symson, *Present State*, p. 241; and Gordon, *Reformed Bishop*, pp. 84, 161, 165.

[2] Mathieson, *Politics and Religion in Scotland*, 1550–1695, ii. p. 190.

The case for the continuity of Presbyterian orders might be held to derive some support from that leaven of regularity which certainly came in through the First Episcopate. When that regime collapsed in 1638, a large proportion of the ministers in the parishes must have received their 'ordinarie calling' through bishops; and the presbyters who then began to ordain may well be supposed to have possessed all the authority for that function which belongs to the presbyterate. It would not indeed be admitted, on Presbyterian principles, that the First Episcopate as such had any unique aptitude for perpetuating a ministry; but it might be argued that the *status* of its holders was at least such as to link them, and those ordained by them, with a certainly continuous tradition of order, and thus to put an end to any doubts engendered by the ambiguous action of Knox and his immediate followers.

The Presbyterian position in any case requires us to admit that there never has been any episcopal ordination in the Church; that the transmission of ministerial authority has in fact been effected by presbyters; that episcopal consecration has conferred on its recipients no further title to ordain than that which they already possessed; and that the ordaining function of the presbyterate, submerged and largely forgotten from the second century to the sixteenth, was then rightly revived, and is still the foundation upon which the Church's confidence in the validity of the ministerial commission should rest.

This position was defended, in the elaborate and learned apologies which the golden age of Presbytery produced, by four main lines of argument. To one of these allusion has already been made. In Scotland it was held, and not only by strict Presbyterians, that the calling of the Reformed clergy could be based in part on their possessing Roman orders. Thus Patrick Forbes of Corse, himself a bishop, defending the ministry of Reformed Churches in general as against the ministry of Antichrist, argues strongly that the regeneration of a Church calls for extraordinary measures, and yet maintains that his opponents are 'impudent to deny our ordinarie vocation,' and that 'it harmeth nothing our cause, that our outward calling hath, in a sort, flowed from the Bishop of Rome.'[1] The argument is cautiously used: it is admitted that the adversary may have something to urge against 'some particular persons, whose defect, if any it were, hurteth not the Church in common': it is buttressed by the plea that 'the want of ordinarie vocation in our first Reformers can be no just exception' against a Church faced with an extraordinary emergency: there is no attempt to show that the Scottish ministry in particular was careful to maintain its status: but it is held that 'our first open contesters with Antichrist in common' were 'ordinarie Churchmen, bearing publike charge of Pastors or Doctours therein.' With even greater erudition and with scholastic elaborateness the same thesis was worked out by Samuel Rutherford, professor at St. Andrews, in the course of his remorseless criticism of New England Independency.[2] Rutherford's problem, at this point, is to maintain the continuity of the true Church through the ages, as against the 'atomism' of his opponent Robinson, and to show that Reformed churches are rightly one with the great stream, though purged from its pollutions. Thus he is led to maintain that 'a succession in the Church is necessary ordinarily; extraordinarily and in cases of necessity, it may be wanting,' while he denies the popish succession to be a note of the Church, since 'right succession must be a succession to truth of doctrine, not personal or total to the chair and naked office.' In such a 'right succession' he holds that 'our blessed Reformers, Hus, Wyclif and Luther' stood, alike in respect of their outward calling, through orders in a Church which retained both baptism and the power to confer ordinary vocation, and in respect of their fidelity to that evangelical truth which the greater part of the mediaeval Church had depraved.

The argument, alike in Forbes and in Rutherford, is stated in general terms. Without an extended study of the copious literature of this period a full appreciation of its significance is impossible; but, after such inquiry as I have been able to make, it looks as if not much more was usually intended by it than that the movement of Reform in general proceeded from persons possessing due ecclesiastical authorisation as teachers; and that it was not meant to imply that Presbyterianism sedulously preserved a '*perpetua successio presbyterorum* from before the Reformation.'

---

[1] *A Defence of the Lawful Calling of the Ministry of Reformed Churches*, pp. 14 ff. (Middelburg, 1614).

[2] *The Due Right of Presbyteries*, pp. 185 ff. (London, 1644).

There remain three coherent lines of argument based on the principles and practice of pre-Reformation Christendom. It is held, on Biblical and sub-apostolic evidence, that the transmission of authority through presbyters is a primitive and therefore an indestructible element in Church order; that this primitive strain persisted in patristic tradition, as exemplified by the teaching of Ambrosiaster, St. Jerome and others, and also by the early practice of the Alexandrian Church; and that scholasticism was radically presbyterian, since it regarded the episcopate as constituting with the presbyterate one *ordo sacerdotum*. These three contentions, taken together, have been felt to provide Presbyterian orders with a sufficient background in history, and to establish them as embodying, through a revival, an original principle never entirely forgotten by the Church.

St. Jerome would doubtless have made short work of such prelacy as existed in Scotland down to 1560; but that he would ever have tolerated ordination by presbyters there is not the least reason to believe. We may conceive that he would have been as much at ease under the First Episcopate as he would have been embarrassed by what began in 1638. The problems arising out of his teaching and influence are properly discussed elsewhere; they need not detain us here; nor in so far as the scholastic doctrine of orders was based on St. Jerome's teaching need we pause to consider the theory that all priests possess an aptitude for transmitting orders which only the rules of jurisdiction prevent them from exercising. But the argument from the Schoolmen has a more interesting and apparently a more important aspect, as Dr. Selwyn[1] has pointed out. If what underlay their exaltation of the presbyterate was the conviction that an order which can celebrate the Eucharist is competent to minister all the sacraments, then the Schoolmen were only reasoning, in the twelfth century, as the Reformers did in the sixteenth ; to the former it was the Mass that mattered, to the latter it was the preaching of the Word ; and both alike asserted that the ' aptitude ' for these supreme functions included all other possible aptitudes. But then it seems possible that neither Schoolman nor Calvinist was wholly in the right, and that both alike, by isolating certain aspects of the ministerial function and giving them a misleading emphasis, did violence to that far more ancient and massively supported tradition which regarded presbyters, whether teaching, baptizing or presiding at the Eucharist, as delegates and subordinates of the bishop. And, however this may be, if the inner meaning of the scholastic teaching was really that the Mass is supremely important, it must be embarrassing for a Presbyterian to allow much weight to arguments based on a position which his tradition compels him to repudiate.

---

[1] *The First Book of the Irenicum*, pp. 21 ff.

In the end, however, the whole matter goes back to Calvin, and from him to the New Testament. No more impressive defence of the Presbyterian thesis can be imagined than the massive logic of the Institutes. That logic, it must be remembered, arose from the urgent needs of a period of revolution. The chief need, as it seemed, was the re-establishment of the Gospel in its purity and the renovation of the Church according to the mind of Christ. There was no institution to which men could turn which was not deeply committed to the perpetuation of evils that cried out for reform ; there seemed to be no possibility of inducing the existing hierarchy to co-operate in the purging of the Church. But in the Bible, with its unchallenged authority for all Christian theologians, it seemed possible to discover, and obligatory to seek, the essence of the Faith and the archetypal form of order. There at least it must be possible to learn by what truths and in what discipline the Lord intended that His Church should for ever be guided.

Thus, in order to discern and disentangle the abiding elements of Church order, nothing, it seemed, was necessary but to take the Acts and Epistles, subtract from them everything which could not have been meant to survive the Apostolic period, and assume that the residue represented the Lord's own institution and bequest. True, the Epistles were written while the Apostles were still alive, but the Apostolic office could not pass away ; it was therefore safe to infer that of the offices enumerated in Ephesians, those of Apostle, prophet, evangelist were transitory, while pastor and teacher were permanent ; that pastor, elder, bishop meant one thing in the Apostles' lifetime, and must always have been intended to mean one thing. Of pastor-bishops, then, with ' governors ' to assist them in keeping discipline, and deacons to care for the poor, the ministry must always have consisted and must still consist. There could be no higher office ; and therefore authority must always have been transmitted through the holders of that grade which is equivalent to the pastoral or episcopal order of the earliest days. This coherent scheme, drawn out in the Fourth Book of the Institutes, is the true basis of Presbyterian order.

It does not belong to this chapter to scrutinise the New Testament evidence for this or that theory of the Ministry. It may suffice to indicate one line of thought which makes it hard to acquiesce in the Calvinist position.

If it could be granted that Calvin's process of subtraction is convincing, and that it enables us, by leaving out the Apostles, to arrive at the Apostolic norm of order, then Calvin and his followers were right, and the main stream of Church tradition has forsaken a standard to which it ought to have adhered. But this assumption is not an easy one for those who think of the stream of Christian life as continuous. To them it seems that the history of the second century flows on without a break from that of the first ; and the Church which moved, as by an inward impulse affecting all its communities everywhere, towards the adoption of a type of order rooted in apostolic precedent, seems to be as sane in that movement as it was in others. If that Church was loyal to its fundamentals when it took the momentous step of equating the apostolic writings with the Old Testament, and of articulating its rule of faith, what reason is there to question its sanity and its loyalty in the sphere of order ? On this view, Calvinism seems to cut through history as with an axe ; and that Word of God to which its ministry is agreeable seems to be but a fragment, an arbitrary abstraction from a continuous Divine utterance.

Such, I imagine, is the judgment which an Anglican student might be constrained to pass upon the one narrowly isolated aspect of Presbyterian orders which has been under review. The great things which God has wrought, and works, through them, I would not presume to measure. Nor would I suggest that that obstinate residuum of discontinuity which derives to them from their Genevan ancestry, despite their close conformity in other points to the Catholic tradition, is imputable to the Presbyterian Churches alone. The fault, if fault there be, seems rather to lie with those who, possessing the ancient order, betrayed or mishandled its claim to the respect of Christians. All that need be said is that there is a gap at this point between Christian societies deeply akin to each other, a gap which the wisdom and charity of a penitent Christendom would not leave unfilled.

At certain points of their past history, and in certain elements of their present practice, the 'people called Methodists' approximate to the Presbyterians. The practice of ordination, when first ventured on by John Wesley, was based on Presbyterian principles; the present practice of Wesleyan Methodists in this country[1] recalls, though, as we shall see, it hardly derives directly from, that of their founder. 'Methodism,' wrote a Wesleyan theologian[2] still held in esteem, 'is Presbyterian as to the basis of its theory; its ministers are of one order only, its Conference being composed of representatives of the Presbytery of the body of Societies or Churches forming the Connexion.' Methodism, indeed, gives complete effect to the Presbyterian principle of the parity of ministers. Its superintendents, who, according to Dr. Pope, 'occupy precisely the position of early episcopacy and of episcopacy in some parts of Lutheranism,' resemble the superintendents of Knox's time ; so do the bishops, who do the work of superintendence, with far greater powers, in the Methodist Episcopal Churches of America ; they are not an order. Methodism differs indeed from Presbyterianism in discipline, in the absence of the ruling elder from its polity, and in the relatively smaller emphasis which it lays upon the due transmission of ministerial authority ; but its differences from Congregationalism appear to be deeper. ' The offices of the Presbytery,' wrote Dr. Pope,[1] ' have relation not only to individual churches but to congregations of churches. Neither in the Old Testament nor in the New is there anything to favour the supposition that a congregation was ever regarded as isolated and independent in its government.' [2]

---

[1] The Form for Ordaining Priests, in the Prayer Book, is now used almost in its entirety in Wesleyan ordinations; there is an imposition of hands by the President of the Conference, with other ministers, the form being, 'Mayest thou receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Christian Minister and Pastor, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands; and be thou a faithful minister of the Word of God and of his Holy Sacraments; in the name, etc.' Then a Bible is delivered to the ordinand, with the words, 'Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments in the congregation.'

[2] Dr. W. B. Pope, *Compendium of Christian Theology*, iii. p. 358.

English Methodism, though it makes the fullest use of lay ministrations in preaching and in matters of business, has not retained a diaconate. The administration of sacraments has in Wesleyan Methodism been restricted to the ordained ministry,[3] and a rule, not absolute in its rigidity, will safeguard this practice as normal in united English Methodism for the future. Primitive Methodists, on the other hand, have allowed lay ministrations, and indeed make a regular practice of encouraging them on stated occasions. Yet, although most Wesleyans would be reluctant to relax their own rule on this point, there appears to be a feeling among them that it is a rule of propriety rather than a principle of order.

The history of the Methodist ministry, in that aspect of it which comes under notice here, may be divided into four periods : (i) from 1746 to 1784, a time of indecision and conflict ; (ii) from 1784 to Wesley's death in 1791, the short period of Wesley's own ordinations ; (iii) from 1791 to 1836, the working out of inevitable consequences, and the establishment of the Society as a separated Church; (iv) from 1836, when the practice of ordination by imposition of hands was adopted, to the present day.

---

[1] *Op cit.* pp. 346 f.

[2] John Wesley's versatile mind made room at times for speculations tinged with Congregationalism ; but these have never found actual expression in Methodist polity.

[3] Dr. W. F. Lofthouse in ' The Anglican Communion ' (*Report of Cheltenham Church Congress*, 1928, p. 427) : ' Wesleyans do restrict the administration of the sacraments to ordained ministers, or, more precisely, to ministers authorised by the Conference to administer them.'

(i) In 1745, the preaching movement having now been in full activity for six years, Wesley could still write[1] 'We believe it would not be right for us to administer either baptism or the Lord's Supper, unless we had a commission so to do from those bishops whom we apprehend to be in a succession from the Apostles. We believe there is, and always was, in every Christian church (whether dependent on the bishop of Rome or not) an outward priesthood, ordained by Jesus Christ, and an outward sacrifice offered therein, by men authorised to act as ambassadors of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God. We believe that the threefold order of ministers is not only authorised by its apostolical institution, but also by the written word.'

In the following year, however, his opinions began to undergo a change. At the preachers' conference of 1745, indeed, there was a rather academic discussion of church order, and the suggestion was made that Wesley might be called bishop or overseer of all congregations gathered by him as a preacher of the Gospel. But Wesley himself ascribes his change of view to the reading of two books, the 'Irenicum' of Stillingfleet and the 'Enquiry' of Lord Chancellor Peter King.[2] The 'Irenicum,' published in 1659, a work which its author repudiated in his later years, was an argument directed against nonconformity in favour of a compromise between Presbyterianism and the Church, and designed to show that church government is immaterial and was left undecided by the Apostles. Of King's book Wesley notes that, in spite of the vehement prejudice of his education, he was ready to believe that it was a fair and impartial draught, but that if so, 'it would follow that bishops and presbyters are essentially of one order, and that, originally, every Christian congregation was a church independent of all others.' The doubts thus engendered are reflected in the Conference minutes of 1747.

---

[1] 'Letter to Westley Hall,' in *Works*, vol. iii. pp. 229 f.

[2] *An Enquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity and Worship of the Primitive Church that flourished within the first three hundred years after Christ* was published anonymously in 1691. King had a scholar's mind, and the *History of the Apostles' Creed* which he issued in 1702 seems to be the earliest attempt to trace the development of that formula. The *Enquiry* is an orderly, well-documented, sensible book, entirely free from the spirit of contention. King discerned clearly the mon-episcopal character of the early Church, but held that presbyters differed only *gradu* from bishops, and not *ordine.* 'A presbyter,' he says, 'was a person in Holy Orders having thereby an inherent right to perform the whole office of a bishop, but being possessed of no place and parish, nor actually discharging it without the permission and consent of the bishop of a place or parish.' Presbyters could not baptise, celebrate the Eucharist, absolve, preach, or even choose a subject for preaching, without episcopal leave, nor had they an equal power in government. With the bishop's leave, however, they were competent for all these functions, even for the restoration of penitents. King believed that even in the third century there was no episcopal function which presbyters might not perform, arguing

By this time Wesley had a considerable band of lay preachers working for him all over England, and could entertain no doubt of his right to authorise men for the preaching of the Gospel, a duty which he was always careful to distinguish from ordination to the sacramental ministry. Thus in 1746 we find Joseph Cowley, who was not ordained till forty-two years later, receiving such a commission. Causing him to kneel down, Wesley put a New Testament in his hand, with the words, 'Take thou authority to preach the Gospel.' Similar was the commissioning of Adam Clarke. 'I departed,' he says, 'having received, in addition to my appointment from God to preach the Gospel, the only authority I could have from man, in that line in which I was to exercise the Ministry of the Divine word.' Nothing was indeed more natural than that the head of a new order

somewhat precariously from an expression used by Firmilian in his letter to Cyprian, and from the fact that Cyprian delegated all his functions, when absent from Carthage, to presbyters. If, then, presbyters performed the whole office of a bishop; they were identical with bishops in order. All this, as one would expect, is confirmed by arguments drawn from the New Testament, the Apostolic Fathers, Irenaeus, and Clement of Alexandria.

King did not write, indeed, as a Presbyterian: 'A church,' he says, 'can be as well without presbyters as it may be without a curate: it suffices that a parish should have a bishop: if, however, there are presbyters, the powers given them by ordination are identical with those of any bishop, and are only restricted in their use by the episcopal jurisdiction.' On the thesis thus worked out it was obviously possible to argue that any bishop might give a presbyter permission to confirm or to ordain; it was equally clear that no sacramental function could be duly discharged by any presbyter without episcopal licence. Half a century after the *Enquiry* appeared, its thesis, without regard to that limitation, was applied in practice by John Wesley.

of lay preachers should issue his own commissions ; but it was significant that he made use, in so doing, of a part of the form for ordaining deacons, and we may surmise that the constant exercise of this limited authority helped to build up, in Wesley's mind, that conviction of his own authority upon which he acted towards the end of his life. Later Methodists, indeed,[1] are prone to think of Wesley's commissioned preachers as possessing, *de iure* at least, full ministerial capacity. This view came to have serious practical results at the end of the century, though it was never explicitly held by Wesley himself[2] ; and from the middle of the century onward[3] pressure was continually being brought to bear upon him to give the preachers a status and a liberty which would enable them to itinerate as fully qualified pastors. Indeed, the unrest and conflict engendered by that pressure was never allayed except when the controversies centring round perfectibility and Calvinism diverted attention from them.

(ii) It was the problem of the American societies, after the War of Independence, that precipitated a crisis. Their members, numbering nearly 15,000, needed the sacraments, and the available Anglican clergy, greatly reduced in numbers through the war, were for the most part unacceptable to Methodist minds. As early as 1779 certain preachers in the south had 'proceeded to ordain themselves by the hands of three of their senior members,'[4] and were with difficulty restrained from continuing to act as clerics. John Wesley, to whom the problem was referred, attempted in vain to persuade Lowth, Bishop of London, to ordain

[1] *E.g.* Watson, *Life of John Wesley* (12th ed., p. 374) : 'The preachers were not mere teachers, but pastors in the fullest sense . . . and if they were constituted teachers and pastors by his ordination without the circumstance of the imposition of hands, it is utterly impossible to conceive that that ceremony conveyed any larger right, as such, to administer the sacraments.'

[2] In October 1754, when hard pressed by circumstance, Wesley said to his brother Charles, 'We have in effect ordained already,' and was inclined to lay on hands ; but by the following February he was in a different mind. (C. Wesley's *Journal and Letters*, quoted in Tyerman, *Life and Times*, pp. 202 ff.)

[3] Especially in 1754–5, when the Perronets, Charles and Edward, took the law into their own hands, and in 1760, when the Norwich preachers followed their example. Charles Wesley's vehement protests, constantly repeated, helped to keep his brother for a time on the safe side of 'the Rubicon.'

[4] Tyerman, iii. p. 427.

one Hoskins for ministry to 'a little flock in America.' Hoskins was refused as being too unlearned; and Wesley wrote with pardonable bitterness that his lordship 'did see good to ordain, and send to America, other persons, who knew something of Greek and Latin, but knew no more of saving souls than of catching whales.' The bishop's reluctance may in fact have had other grounds than those alleged. But in effect it precluded Wesley from taking any action within the limits which he had hitherto observed. That he must take action seemed overwhelmingly clear; that the circumstances were so abnormal as to justify abnormal action it seemed possible to argue. 'Many of the provinces of North America are totally disjoined from the mother country . . . a civil authority is exercised over them, but no one either claims or exercises any ecclesiastical authority at all.' 'The case is widely different between England and North America. Here there are bishops who have a legal jurisdiction; in America there are none, neither any parish minister; so that, for some hundreds of miles together, there is none either to baptize or to administer the Lord's supper.'[1]

Was there 'any rational and scriptural way of feeding and guiding these poor sheep in the wilderness?' Wesley took the only way that seemed open. Two clergymen attached to the Countess of Huntingdon's society had already held an ordination, thus opening a passage across the Rubicon. Wesley followed. 'On September 1, 1784,' Whatcoat's 'Journal' tells us, 'John Wesley, Thomas Coke and James Creighton, presbyters of the Church of England, formed a presbytery and ordained myself and Thomas Vasey deacons'; on the next day, by the same hands, Whatcoat and Vasey were ordained elders, and Coke was made a 'superintendent.' 'I have this day,' so runs Wesley's certificate, still preserved at Centenary Hall, 'set apart by the imposition of my hands and prayer (being assisted by other ordained ministers), Thomas Coke, D.C.L., presbyter of the Church of England, as superintendent for the Church of God, under our care in America.'

---

[1] Letter to Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and our Brethren in North America, September 10, 1784.

The ordination of Vasey and Whatcoat was indeed a practical application of principles which John Wesley had held, in theory, for nearly forty years. That of Coke, on the other hand, was strangely perplexing, and has been variously interpreted. Coke was in priest's orders: what did Wesley's action purport to make him? A mere superintendent? If so, why was the imposition of hands, with the co-operation of other ordained ministers, necessary? A bishop? But on Wesley's principles a presbyter was already as truly a 'scriptural *episcopos*' as any man could be. Coke at least had no doubt as to the significance of the ceremony, and hastened to adopt the episcopal title. Wesley 'shuddered at the assumption'; but his brother Charles was under no illusion as to the thing that had been done; his brother, his old intimate friend and companion, had assumed the episcopal character, had ordained elders, consecrated a bishop, and sent him to ordain the lay preachers in America.[1] The fact that within three months a Scottish consecration had provided America with a 'real bishop' added to Charles' despair and indignation. There were others beside Charles who were deeply moved. 'I wish they had been asleep,' wrote a preacher, 'when they began this business of ordination: it is neither episcopal nor presbyterian, but a mere hodge-podge of inconsistencies.'

The 'business of ordination,' however, once begun, was destined to continue. There was a country nearer than America, in which Methodists were not always welcome, and where it was not easy for them to have access to sacraments. The Episcopalian clergy in Scotland were not inclined to hospitable dealings with the societies; John Wesley misliked Presbyterianism and would not hand over his followers to the Establishment. So it came about that after thorough deliberation he 'yielded to the judgment of a few select friends' and, on August 1, 1785, set apart three well-tried preachers[2] to minister in Scotland, one as a deacon and two as presbyters. Once again, Wesley was able to persuade himself that this step involved no separation. Methodists had no connection with the Church of Scotland:

---

[1] Letter to Dr. Chandler, April 28, 1785.

[2] John Pawson, Thomas Hanby, Joseph Taylor.

the English Church had no concern with anything done north of the Border. Ordinations for Scotland were held in the three following years; but Wesley attempted, by an exercise of disciplinary power, to blunt the edge of the facts. Pawson was allowed to call himself 'reverend' in Scotland, but was told that he and his colleagues, on returning to England, must revert to their original status: 'we are to be just what we were before we came to Scotland.'

Ordinations for Antigua and Newfoundland, in 1786, were now no innovation; but a further change was made in 1788. Wesley now began to set apart men 'for the office of a presbyter in the Church of God,'[1] and to ordain persons who were not intended to be sent out of England. Wesley ordained Mather, Rankin and Moore 'without sending them out of England, strongly advising them at the same time that according to his example they should continue united to the Established Church, so far as the blessed work in which they were engaged would permit.'[2] Mather indeed, according to Pawson, was made a bishop, and was designed, like Coke, to ordain others, but this does not appear in Wesley's 'Journal.' In Pawson's judgment, the ordaining of preachers for England was never part of Wesley's original intention; but when the venture had once been made it was intended to be continued by others. Moore told the Conference so in 1791, and wrote in 1837: 'I am the only person now alive that Mr. W. committed that power to, and I know that he committed it for the purpose that it should become a common thing whenever it should be judged by the Conference best to adopt it.'

Charles Wesley suffered deeply at this time. His brother was above logic, and was serenely able at any moment to extemporise a foothold on ground that to mere reason seemed incapable of supporting any weight; *heroische Inconsequenz* is Dr. Nuelsen's[3] apt phrase. Charles saw clearly that ordination was separation, and lost all hope. Only one thing was left to him—he loved his brother, and in that love at least he never wavered. Methodism was still committed, by official declarations,[1] to remain attached to the Church of England. John was still able to convince himself that neither he nor the bulk of the Methodists had any design of separation,[2] and to tell the Irish preachers, in a famous sermon,[3] that their office was purely prophetic. Did any of them wonder, when he told them that the administration of sacraments was none of their business, what the English ordinations really meant? Had Wesley himself forgotten them when he urged that if Methodists kept to a plan which he had himself deserted they could never separate, and that apart from preaching abroad, praying *extempore*, and forming societies, he had in no way differed from the Church? Without doubt, all this was self-evident to the preacher, but to those who, like his brother, faced the hard facts in the light of principles obstinately held, it was equally plain that the facts would soon belie the 'heroic inconsequence' of their interpreter.

---

[1] Certificate given to Robert Gamble, August 1788.

[2] Myler and Moore, *Chapters on the History of the Methodists*, p. 175.

[3] Bishop John Nuelsen's *Geschichte des Methodismus* is an admirable survey of a wide field.

(iii) After John Wesley's death the question of ordination seems to recede into the background. The Conference of 1791 engaged itself to 'follow strictly the plan which Mr. Wesley has left us,' but whether that meant that the sacraments should not be given except in places where they had been already granted, or that the circuits should go forward independently, no one could determine. In 1793 it was decided that 'Societies should have the privilege of the Lord's Supper where they unanimously desire it,' and in the following year this privilege was granted to ninety-three places. Then a divergence of opinion at Broadmead Chapel, upon the propriety of administration by preachers, led to the adoption in 1795 of a 'Plan of Pacification,' which enjoined that the Lord's Supper, baptism, burial, and service in church hours must not be allowed unless the majority of the trustees, stewards, and leaders of a chapel approved, and could assure the Conference in writing that no separation would ensue. Existing usages were left undisturbed.

Thus in England Methodism moved steadily on into separation : by the Plan of Pacification the die was cast.[1] A similar plan, after some controversy, was adopted in Ireland in 1816, but gave rise to a secession which affirmed its loyalty to the Church, and indeed might conceivably have united with it after disestablishment, but effected complete union with the Wesleyan Conference in 1878.

---

[1] At the Conferences of 1789 and, less formally, 1790.

[2] *Magazine*, xiii. (April 1790).

[3] At Cork, May 4, 1789.

In America a Methodist Episcopal Church voted itself into existence at Christmas 1784 ; much though John Wesley disliked it, Coke acted as he believed Wesley had meant him to do, and consecrated Asbury to be a superintendent with him. As by Wesley in England, so here some deference was paid to ancient form. Asbury was ordained deacon, elder, and superintendent on successive days. Twenty-four years later Coke, who, it was believed, would have liked to be an Anglican bishop, revealed a correspondence which he had carried on with Bishop White of the Protestant Episcopal Church ; it was an attempt, alleged to be in accordance with Wesley's mind, to effect a scheme of union, based on the re-ordination of Coke, Asbury, and the preachers. But Asbury was not privy to the matter, and though Coke urged that the scheme guarded the validity of Methodist ordination, the new imposition of hands being only a concession to Episcopalian scruple, the temper of neither communion was favourable to such projects, and the scheme was abandoned.[2]

In respect of its ordinations, American Episcopal Methodism divides its ministry into two orders, those of deacon and elder, which derive historically from the ordinations of Coke and Asbury. Their bishops are elected and consecrated, but are, in respect of *ordo*, elders still. As a matter of jurisdiction, however, the function of ordaining belongs to them ; so that the ministry of their Churches, while Presbyterian in origin, is tripartite in function and mon-episcopal in practice.

It appears, then, that it was only in America that the ordinations of John Wesley were in any sense perpetuated. In England, on the other hand, the *status* of preachers depended on their being admitted to ‘full connexion with the Conference’: their authority to minister, varying from circuit to circuit in the earliest years, gradually grew to be an acknowledged competence, resting upon the Conference's act of admission to exercise all ministerial functions. ‘The solemn admission of preachers into full connexion by the lifting of the hand, and the conferring of the right to administer the sacraments, changed the company of travelling preachers into a ministerial order.[1] There was no imposition of hands; the use of that ceremony was indeed proposed in 1822, four years after the title ‘reverend’ had been adopted, but it was felt that such an innovation would distress the ‘Church Methodists,’[2] and throw doubt upon the accepted mode of ‘ordination.’ Then—there is no record to show how—the practice of laying hands on men designed for foreign service crept in. It was not till 1836 that the Conference, after protracted discussion, determined that ‘an ordination service’ with imposition of hands ‘should be held that year.’ ‘This step,’ say the authors of the ‘New History,’ ‘was a distinct declaration that Wesleyan Methodism[3] had become a church . . . ; the names “united societies,” and “people called Methodists,” might be preserved, but the status of a distinct branch of the Church was avowed and demanded.’

---

[1] Townsend, Eayres, and Workman, *New History*, ii. p. 386.

[2] The correspondence is printed in Bangs, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, ii. 200 ff.

Wesleyan Methodist ordinations, then, though they work out the general logic of the founder's career, diverge in fact somewhat widely from his principles and practice. Wesley as a presbyter ordained preachers: the preachers of 1836 ordained in their own right, as possessing the Conference's authority to minister. Wesley's ordinations were Presbyterian: those of 1836 were Wesleyan, and repose upon the prerogative of a self-contained society, functioning with full assurance as a Church, continuous with the preaching society of Wesley's time, but divided clearly, at this point, alike from its founder's intentions and from the Church whose commission he held.

---

[1] *New History*, ii. pp. 405 f.

[2] *I.e.* those members of the societies who still adhered to the practice of going to the parish churches for the Sacraments.

[3] Primitive Methodism, which had long seceded, was of course unaffected by the change, which it has never imitated.

THE ORIGINS OF EPISCOPACY IN THE *UNITAS FRATRUM*

THE *Unitas Fratrum* in all its provinces is the offspring of that community of fugitives from Moravian valleys which took refuge at Herrnhut, on Count Zinzendorf's estate, in 1722. Their desire to retain and revive their ancient religious heritage led Zinzendorf, who recognised its high claim to respect, to take the lead in reorganising their church life. Their traditions, which dated back to the middle of the fifteenth century, had always included an episcopate.

In 1734 the learned Daniel Jablonski, head of the surviving ' Brothers ' in Poland, offered to consecrate one of their number as bishop for missionary work ; David Nitschmann was accordingly consecrated on March 13, 1745, for the colonies and foreign missions of the brethren. Zinzendorf waited (reluctantly, it seems) for two years, and then was also consecrated (May 20, 1737), at the command of the Prussian King and with the approval of Potter, Archbishop of Canterbury. It is from these consecrations, and from the revival of the orders of presbyter and deacon that accompanied them, that ' Moravian ' orders are derived, as was recognised when, on May 12, 1749, an Act of our Parliament acknowledged the *Unitas* as a Protestant Episcopal Church.

Jablonski's own consecration goes back through his father, Peter Jablonski (Figulus), to bishop John Bythner. The great Comenius was in 1648 the sole surviving bishop of the Bohemian Brothers, scattered and almost exterminated by persecution after 1620. Comenius (who bequeathed his church to the care of the Church of England) secured the succession by giving a commission for Peter's consecration. These orders thus go back through the Polish branch of the Brethren to the earliest stage of their history.

The facts thus far are clear and well attested. But the beginnings of succession among the Brethren are extremely obscure. Bishop Hassé (' Encycl. Rel. and Eth., viii. 837) relates them thus : ' At the Synod of Lhota in 1647 they

. . . proceeded to elect their own ministers, and for these they obtained ordination from the Waldenses, whose bishop, Stephen, consecrated Michael Bradacius as the first bishop of the *Unitas*.' This account, which has long been traditional, was questioned by Bishop Stubbs, and is hard to reconcile with the oldest documentary evidence.[1] If it were well-grounded, we should have to inquire whether Stephen was in fact a bishop; that problem, however, which Stubbs investigated with care, seems to have little relevance as the case now stands.

This Stephen, a friend of the Waldensian bishop, Friedrich Reiser, had some relations with the almost unorganised community which settled at or near Kunwald in 1457 or 1458. Rejecting the ministry of all priests who seemed to them morally dubious, they desired a pure priesthood; vain inquiries were made among the Paulicians and the Oriental Orthodox; Stephen desired to convince them that the Waldensian ministry had a pure origin (the word *původ*, rendered *Ursprung*, seems to connote more than mere succession) and so to bring about a union; this was much discussed, but came to nothing. Then in 1467 civil war broke out; the king was excommunicated, and on August 19, 1467, Stephen the Waldensian was burnt at Vienna. The discovery by Bartǒs of the *acta* of the Inquisition which establish this date has made it difficult to hold that this Stephen was the person through whom the Brethren received their ministry; for a letter from the Brethren themselves in 1470–71, to Kostka, clearly distinguishes between 'an old priest who willingly did for us what he was besought to do' and 'the other priest Stephen'; and similarly in 1496 the Brethren distinguished between 'him who authorised' and 'the other who was burnt.'

In fact, the 'bishop Stephen' does not make his appearance in the documents, as the ordainer of the Brethren's ministry, till 1496, when a dispute was held at Chlumec over a controversial pamphlet emanating from a minority of the Brethren. Far older evidence is available. It is that of Gregory, the first spiritual leader of the Brethren, in his fourth letter sent in 1468 to (? his uncle) Rokycana, Utraquist Archbishop of Prague, supported by a letter of 1478 from Magister Wenzel Koranda to Johann Kostka of Postupic, relating what had been said to the Masters of Prag by Michael, who played one of the chief parts in the whole business. These documents are borne out by a treatise 'on good and bad Priests,' dating from 1468–9.

---

[1] It was formerly accepted by the learned historian of Herrnhut, Dr. Müller (Herzog-Hauck, *Real-Encycl.* iii. pp. 446 ff.), but he now rejects it (*Gesch. der böhm. Brüder*, i. (1922), and *Zeitschs. für böhm. Gesch.* (1916–17)).

The story which thus emerges is this : Several meetings were held in 1467 to settle whether the Brethren, hitherto guided by itinerant preachers, should break with Roman order completely and set up an order like that of the primitive Church, and whether this was God's will. The answer obtained was 'Yes' ; then, at Lhota near Reichenau, nine Brethren having been chosen out, lots were cast to decide whether three of them (or fewer, or none at all) should be made priests. Matthias of Kunwald, Elias of Chrenow, and Thomas of Přelouč were thus chosen, Matthias being then selected by lot for 'the first place.' Then a doubt arose : was this choice sufficient by itself? Or should Michael, who was a priest and a Brother, hand on his Roman orders? It was remembered at this point that Peter of Chelcic had spoken of the Waldensian ministry as apostolic in 'origin.' So it was decided that Michael should go to a certain Waldensian 'senior,' obtain authorisation (ordination) from him, and then return to pass on his Waldensian and Roman authorisation to the three who had been chosen. The Waldensian, when approached, acted without hesitation. Michael returned, and consecrated Matthias to be bishop ; then he renounced his Roman orders, and, together with Elias and Thomas, was ordained as a priest for the Brethren.

A new order was thus initiated, breaking so completely with the past that, according to Rokycana, the Brethren were now re-baptised by the new priests. The principles underlying this strange story are fully illustrated in the tract 'on good and bad Priests.' Roman and Utraquist priests, it teaches, relying on succession apart from the new birth, cannot provide a valid ministry. An inwardly 'consecrated bishop' (priest-elder) is needed, who will decide whether the divine choice is plain, and whether the testimony of the faithful to the ordinand's freedom from deadly sin is clear ; only those who are thus tested and authorised pass duly through the door into the sheepfold.

Such then are the principles, and such seems to have been the procedure, from which the 'Moravian' ministry, so tenacious now, as in past centuries, of an authority transmitted through bishops, took its beginning.

[A copious bibliography will be found at the head of Müller's article ('Brüder, böhmische') in the 'Real-Encyclopädie,' edn. 3. The texts printed by Goll, 'Quellen und Untersuchungen,' need now to be supplemented by Müller's later work, which entirely supersedes de Schweinitz' 'History.' Gregory's 'Fourth Letter' is translated in Lützow, 'Bohemian Literature,' pp. 208 ff., as Mr. R. F. Young kindly informed me. Certain material is only available to those who, unlike myself, can read Czech.]

X

EPISCOPACY AND REUNION

By Darwell Stone

I. An important declaration on the subject of reunion was made by the American Church at the General Convention held at Chicago in 1886. At the Convention a report on this subject was presented by a committee of the House of Bishops. The report, which was expressed in conciliatory language, recognised the existence of 'inherent parts of the sacred deposit of Christian faith and order committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church,' and described these as 'essential to the restoration of unity.' These 'inherent parts of the sacred deposit,' in addition to Holy Scripture, the Nicene Creed, and the Sacraments of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, included 'the Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church.' This report was adopted by the House of Bishops and communicated to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies; and the Convention passed a resolution authorising the circulation of the Declaration contained in the Committee's report.

Two years later this action on the part of the American Church began to bear fruit. In 1888 the Lambeth Conference, though not repeating the emphatic words 'inherent parts of the sacred deposit' and 'essential to the restoration of unity,' adopted with slight alterations the first three articles of the Chicago Convention, retained without any alteration the words relating to the episcopate, and said that all the four articles 'supply a basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made towards Home

Reunion.' These four articles, thus adopted from Chicago, came to be known as the 'Lambeth Quadrilateral,' and had an important influence in many later discussions. In substance they were repeated by the Lambeth Conference of 1920. The phrase in the fourth article was indeed then altered from that already quoted to the words 'A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body'; but this alteration, however much to be regretted, still expressed by inference the necessity of episcopacy, since it is obvious that neither the Church of Rome nor the Orthodox Church of the East would ever acknowledge that a non-episcopal ministry possessed 'the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body,' and the Conference itself added a suggestion that 'the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry' as had been described.

The bishops of the Anglican Communion have thus committed themselves to the retention of episcopacy in any reunion. It is true that the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference do not bind anyone. It is a conference, not a council or synod. In the invitation to the first Conference, issued in 1867, Dr. Longley, the then Archbishop of Canterbury, explicitly wrote that the Conference 'would not be competent to make declarations or lay down definitions on points of doctrine'; and he had previously said in the Upper House of Convocation, 'I should refuse to convene any assembly which pretended to enact any canons, or affected to make any decisions binding on the Church.' But the resolutions affirmed by the Conference afford an indication of the convictions held by the collective body of Anglican bishops, the importance of which, provided that they are not regarded as conciliar decisions or synodical canons, it would be difficult to exaggerate. Many recent proceedings raise the question whether it is right still to insist, with the Chicago Convention, on episcopacy as 'inherent' in 'the sacred deposit' and 'essential to the restoration of unity,' or whether future consideration of the whole matter may rightly lead to modifications which will represent episcopacy as neither 'inherent' nor 'essential.'

II. In regard to episcopacy, as to much else, the needs of the present can be rightly estimated only in the light of the past. The Church has always to consider the present and to look forward to the future. In such consideration the past also must have its place. From a simply natural point of view the past has lessons to teach which the present and the future need to learn. When to the natural point of view there is added the conception of the Christian Church as an historic system with a divine revelation behind it and a divinely ordered guidance directing its path, and when moreover the Church is recognised as the mystical body of Christ and the home of the Holy Ghost, the obligation to pay attention to the whole course of its history receives a new character and a vastly additional force.

The problems about the Christian ministry in its earliest history are well known, and it is unnecessary to dwell on them at any length here. While it is clear that episcopacy in the form known as monepiscopacy—that is, the rule of a single bishop over his diocese—was firmly established in some places by the beginning of the second century, and that such a system is the outcome which might well be expected from the facts recorded in the New Testament, the evidence as to other places, notably Rome and Corinth, has been differently interpreted. It has been held, for instance, (1) that at Rome, in the first days of the Church there, the rule of the single bishop, the system of monepiscopacy, existed, and that this was preserved by a continuous succession ; or (2) that the rulers of the Church, the supreme authority, formed a college, a collegiate episcopate, in which several presbyters had all been consecrated bishops, and all shared alike in the government of the Church, and that later one of these was elevated above the rest, when the other presbyters were not consecrated bishops, so that the system of monepiscopacy resulted ; or (3) that the presbyters as such were the chief authority at the first, and that any form of episcopacy was of later growth.[1]

---

[1] I have set out the evidence on which these opinions may be based in my *Episcopacy and Valid Orders in the Primitive Church*, and in a somewhat different form in the article on 'Episcopacy' in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, v. 332–337.

For my own part I think the evidence adequate that the first of these interpretations is right, and this interpretation can claim the support of eminent Church historians; but for the moment let it be supposed that the issue is really doubtful, or that as a matter of fact there were wide differences as to the ministry in the Church of the first century and the earlier part of the second century. If this were so, there would still remain one outstanding fact of supreme importance. Soon after the middle of the second century, at any rate, episcopacy—and in the form of monepiscopacy—was firmly established everywhere.[1] If there had been differences in the past, the Church had corrected them and they had ceased to be. Now, whether it is maintained, as I myself hold, that episcopacy had been the system of the Church from the first century onwards at Rome and in the West as well as in the East, or that the course of events under the providence of God had brought the Church to the universal requirement of episcopacy as other systems were tried and found wanting, in either case episcopacy is what the Church accepted and afterwards maintained, so that, whatever the exact truth as to the details of the earlier history, the judgement of the Universal Church approved the maxim affirmed by St. Ignatius in the opening years of the second century, 'Let that be held to be a valid Eucharist which is under the bishop or one to whom he shall have committed it.'[2]

III. Here it may be necessary to consider an argument which may be suggested by a Roman Catholic who is an historian of the more liberal school or by an Anglican to whom any thought of development brings some perplexity. You accept episcopacy, it may be said, as an essential part of the Christian system because you say that, even if you are wrong in thinking that it was established in the earlier history, the acceptance of it by the Universal Church since the middle of the second century guarantees it as right and certifies it as necessary. Must not this argument lead you somewhat further? Can you assert that the ultimate acceptance of episcopacy shows it to be so necessary that without it there can be no Church, and at the same time refrain from allowing that the papacy also is essential to the existence of the Church? Must you not, to be consistent, regard the true Church as papal as well as episcopal? Must you not acknowledge that the papacy was foreshadowed in the New Testament, that there were events and maxims leading towards it from the first days of the Church, that by a gradual growth it came to be, as the need of it was found and realised, that in some form or other a primacy of Rome was universally recognised, that by the fifth or sixth century the papacy in its characteristic later form was accepted by the Western Church as a necessity of the Church's life, so that, if there were no Pope, there would be no Church?

---

[1] See, *e.g.*, A. Harnack, *Entstehung und Entwickelung der Kirchenverfassung und Kirchenrechts in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten*, p. 60.

[2] St. Ignatius, *Ep. ad Smyrn.* viii. 1.

The argument is serious and needs serious consideration. But there are facts which go to the heart of the question which make it reasonable to regard the evidence for episcopacy as conclusive while not allowing that a like claim can be maintained for the papacy. There are two momentous points which make all the difference between the argument for the papacy and that for episcopacy. First, in the Church of the second and third centuries, while all agree that, where there is no bishop, there is no Church, and that communion with the bishop is necessary for communion with the Church, there is no such assertion or allowance of the necessity of communion with the Pope. And, secondly, while the Church in the East has all along recognised some kind of primacy, not very clearly explained or very easy to define, as belonging to the Pope, the whole history of Eastern Christendom has shown a conviction that the Church can continue to exist without communion with the Pope, and that therefore communion with the Pope is not a necessity of the Church's life, as is episcopacy. The acceptance of episcopacy is in harmony with the facts of the second and third centuries, while the acceptance of the papacy in its developed form is not; and the whole Church, both East and West, is committed to episcopacy, while that developed form of the papacy, as it has been since the fifth and sixth centuries, has been rejected in the East. The differences are vital. The argument that it is unreasonable to affirm the necessity of episcopacy, and not to allow the necessity of communion with the Pope, may safely be set aside.

IV. To St. Ignatius, writing in the early years of the second century, the universality, as he deemed it, of the episcopate was a great fact. He thought of the bishops that were 'settled in the furthest parts of the earth'[1]; it was his conviction that apart from bishops and presbyters and deacons there was not 'even the name of a Church'[2]; but he did not regard this position of the episcopate as a matter of fact only. There was a reason for it. The reason was that the episcopate was not only an actual fact, but also had a sacramental character and influence. The unity of the Church in communion with the bishop must be maintained in order that the one Eucharist might be observed[3]; as there was the bishop, so there was the altar[4]; the severance from the bishop was to be avoided because it was in communion with him that a valid Eucharist could be.[5] It is this sacramental character which makes the office of the bishop essential in the Church.

In the course of history the position of the bishop and his outward surroundings have differed greatly; and different conceptions have been held concerning some aspects of his office. Theologically, there have been different opinions within the Church as to the bishop's relation to the Pope, and as to his relation to the priests. Politically, some bishops have been great statesmen, and others have been insignificant in regard to the State. Socially, some bishops have been high grandees, and others the simplest and most plain living of men. Ecclesiastically, most bishops have been rulers of dioceses, while at the opposite extreme bishops have been in no more prominent position than that of chaplains to religious communities, subject to the abbot or the abbess. Amid all these wide differences there has been one thing which is distinctive. It is the bishop who consecrates other bishops. It is the bishop who ordains priests.

---

[1] *Ep. ad Eph.* iii. 2.

[2] *Ep. ad Trall.* iii. 1.

[3] *Ep. ad Philad.* iii. 2, iv.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Ep. ad Smyrn.* viii. 1.

It is the bishop on whom the Eucharist depends. The reason why there cannot be the Church without the bishop is because without the bishop there cannot be the ministry of the Church ; and without the ministry there cannot be the Church's central rite, the Eucharist. That there is no Church and no priest and no Eucharist if there is no bishop is as true now as when it was said in the third century : If you are to have the Eucharistic sacrifice, you must have the priestly ministry which depends on the episcopate ; and if you are to have the Eucharistic Communion, you must be within the Church which possesses that ministry.[1]

V. This does not mean that there are no gifts of God's grace outside the visible Church. It may well be that the goodness of God outflows its appointed channels. It may well be that He has much to bestow wherever there are any who look to Him for His blessings. The organised service rites of non-episcopal bodies, the avowedly unsacramental devotion of the Society of Friends, may well have their reward from Him who sees the hearts of all who are worshippers. Those who seek Him in good faith may well find Him, whatever be the methods of their approach. Yet, though the grace may outflow the appointed channels, the channels are there. That the worshipper in good faith may himself be accepted does not imply that the rite, or the absence of any rite, also is accepted. Sacraments have their conditions and their necessities. Without bread or without wine there cannot be the Eucharist. As the necessities of material elements, so also there is the necessity of the minister, the priest episcopally ordained. Without these there is not the guarantee of the Church, without these there is not the sacrament. In the lack of bread or of wine there might be some rite which God would accept ; but it would not be the sacrament. So, also, in the lack of the appointed minister there might be something in response to which God would bestow gifts ; but it would not be the sacrament, the Eucharist of the Church.

---

[1] St. Cyprian, *de catholicae ecclesiae unitate*, 13, 17 ; *ep.* lxx. 2. The necessity of the bishop for the Eucharist is expressed in widely separated places, in the East by St. Ignatius (*Ep. ad Smyrn.* viii. 1), at Rome in the earliest *Church Order* (E. Hauler, *Didascaliae apostolorum fragmenta Veronensia*, p. 38), and in Africa by St. Cyprian.

VI. It is this consideration which justifies the historical attitude of the Church. The communion with the Church and the retention of episcopacy have their necessity because of the sacramental character of the ministry and the supreme need of the Eucharist. It is this which makes the claim of the Church and the rigour of the Church reasonable. To maintain the necessity of communion with a bishop is not a piece of merely ecclesiastical discipline, but the outcome and inevitable consequence of a principle which may not be abandoned if that which the Church's life absolutely requires is to be preserved. Apart from this consideration, the insistence on episcopacy might be thought to be irrational or tyrannous or at best an anachronism ; in the light of this consideration the insistence is justified.

A consequence from this aspect of the ministry is the vindication of the declaration by the American Church at the General Convention of 1886 that episcopacy is to be included in the 'inherent parts of the sacred deposit of Christian faith and order' and is 'essential to the restoration of unity.' Similarly, it follows from this aspect of the ministry that the rule of the English Church can be tolerated and is to be commended. The regulation that 'no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereto according to the Form hereafter following [in the English Ordinal], or hath had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination,' would not be easy to defend unless there were some vital principle involved. When the vital principle of the sacramental character of the ministry and the relation of bishop and priest to the Eucharist are considered, the defence is obvious.

VII. It is no charity to disguise or minimise the facts in regard to the theology of the ministry or practical questions concerning the reunion of Christendom. The cause of truth and the welfare of mankind are best served when the facts are most clearly brought out and most frankly expressed and most fully realised. The most important and the most vital of the facts about episcopacy is left out of account if episcopacy is regarded simply as an historical survival, or as a method of government, or as a means of exercising discipline, or as an external device which may promote external unity. The position of the episcopate in Christian history is indeed notable on its outward side ; but its real meaning and its rightful claim to human allegiance are to be seen only in the light of its place in that sacramental system which supplies the appointed means by which the spiritual life of man is created and formed and sanctified and blessed, by which that which is earthly is made to be the school for that which is eternal. It is as the full meaning of the episcopal office, and the imperative claim which it therefore makes, are recognised that it may be seen to be worth while to possess it, worth while to make sacrifices to keep or obtain it.

VIII. The conception of the episcopate has an important bearing on practical questions concerning reunion. It would be much to be true to the lessons of history and to the historical greatness of the bishop's office. It would be much to extend the episcopate as a means of gaining a rallying-point which might promote external unity. It would be much to preserve the episcopate for the sake of avoiding anything which might compromise the Church of England in the eyes of Eastern Christians, or make still more difficult than it already is the prospect of reunion with Rome. All these considerations have their value in their own place. But after all they are on the surface. From their very nature they are capable of readjustment and modification. On the other hand, if the episcopate has a sacramental value, and because of that sacramental value is ' inherent ' in ' the sacred deposit of Christian faith and order ' and ' essential to the restoration of unity,' then the retention of it, and of all which it involves, is a matter of vital consequence which affects the very life of the Church.

Obviously there are many steps towards the reunion of episcopal and non-episcopal bodies which may be taken without any sacrifice of principle. There are the ordinary friendships of social life. There is common work in the causes of philanthropy and beneficence, of succouring the poor and the ignorant and the afflicted, of opposing and preventing great wrongs, of promoting private and public good. There is all the work of clearing away misunderstandings, and finding grounds of agreement, and recognising and appreciating the ways of and the reasons for disagreement. These are preliminaries which pave the way for reunion, but do not accomplish more. As progress is made with them, it is to be expected that definite plans for reunion will emerge, as in fact they have emerged. They too have their value because they show possibilities and afford ground for discussion as to what this or that principle, to which one or another body may be committed, does or does not demand. Among the principles to which the English Church and the Anglican Communion are committed is that of episcopacy. Properly understood, it carries with it that a valid ministry is needed ; and that a valid ministry needs ordination by a bishop. Practical consequences follow both as to the preliminaries which pave the way for reunion and as to definite plans for reunion. Among preliminaries, the popular device of intercommunion as a means towards the end of reunion is necessarily excluded. Communion together at the Lord's Table can be rightly reached only when the process of reunion has been completed. Among definite plans for actual reunion, it is necessary to exclude communion on the part of united bodies with non-episcopal bodies elsewhere, the ministrations of ministers not episcopally ordained, and possibilities of the continuance of a non-episcopal ministry in the future.

The functions of a bishop include Confirmation. Whether, as in the ordinary practice in the West, the bishop himself confirms, or whether, as in the East and in exceptional instances in the West, the priest ministers Confirmation by using chrism which a bishop has consecrated, the bishop is necessary to Confirmation. Confirmation is part of the heritage of the Christian soul. The course of events in the West, which has led to the separation of the administration of Confirmation from the administration of Baptism, may have obscured to some extent in the popular mind the real significance and obligation of Confirmation, so that the receiving of it might seem to be of less value than it actually is. However this may be, the principle of episcopacy, which it is the purpose of this essay to express, requires that Confirmation, either after the Western or after the Eastern method, be a regular part of the equipment of a Christian.

IX. There is a further question which needs to be asked in regard to any scheme for reunion. The question is, What is the extent of real agreement among those proposing to unite? The General Convention of the American Church, to which reference has already been made more than once, put together Holy Scripture, the Nicene Creed, the Sacraments of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, and the historic episcopate as 'inherent parts of the sacred deposit.' These require that those reunited concur in acceptance of belief in the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation and other doctrines contained in the Creed. Do they not really, when sympathetically estimated, require also some degree of common mind as to the nature of the Church and of the ministry and of the sacraments? If a reunion is to be healthy and hopeful, will it not postulate a good deal of mutual understanding and sympathy in regard to doctrine and worship and the corporate life of the Church? There is a practical danger—not in the least imaginary—lest an unwise way of ending a schism might tend to produce another, lest a unity too hastily rebuilt might before long fall into ruin with disastrous effect. It is not to be supposed that all in a reunited Church would exactly agree with one another. Such a state of things would not correspond to anything in the Church's history. But it is important that there should be such an approximation to common sympathies and outlook and temper as may afford reasonable grounds of hope for continued united action and life. This consideration is of a somewhat different nature from the essential requirements of the episcopal principle on which stress has been laid in this chapter. None the less it has an importance which is very great. It may be worth while to recall words written ten years ago by an English divine of great learning which bear on both these points: 'The unity which we desire involves more than a reconstitution of separated ministries under episcopal order. If this were all, the mechanism of such external organisation would be liable to break down at the first real strain. Until we are spiritually much closer together in such matters as common liturgical worship, until the corporate life of the Church, as transcending the life of the individual, is more fully recognised as the ideal, there is even danger in the formal rectification of defective ministries, lest the episcopal succession should be granted away to communities who do not share our deepest convictions as to the nature and functions of the Church, and the episcopate should no longer stand for any real unity at all. A new schism headed by bishops is a contingency too horrible to contemplate ; and a rash external reunion might easily lead to it. The unity we seek must be a real consolidation, resting upon community of ideals, and crowned by unity of organisation. . . . We recognise that Holy Baptism duly administered, though not by an ordained minister of the Catholic Church, is an effectual sacrament and may not be repeated. But we cannot but regard it as defective, if it be not completed by the Laying on of Hands. And again, we recognise that the Lord's Supper, though not administered by a priest, conveys spiritual benefits to those who partake of it in faith. But we hold that the Eucharist of the Church is more than a means of grace for the individual believer, and was from the end of the first century, at any rate, primarily regarded as an Offering of Thanksgiving to God—" the offering of the gifts " on behalf of the corporate society of Christians—an offering which could only be duly made by the authorised minister of the Church. In other words there can be no due celebration of the Holy Eucharist without a priest. . . . We shall not be loyal to the early Church if we accept a diminished sacrament in place of the full Eucharist of Catholic antiquity. Nor can we dissociate the celebration of the Eucharist from our necessary interpretation of the historic episcopate.' [1]

[1] Dr. J. Armitage Robinson, Dean of Wells, *The Apostolic Succession*, pp. 4–6, being the Preface to a sermon preached at the consecration of five bishops in St. Paul's Cathedral on St. John the Baptist's Day, 1920.

XI

THE FREE CHURCHES AND EPISCOPACY

By Sir HENRY LUNN

IT is essential in considering the attitude of the Free Churches towards Episcopacy, in its bearing on the present proposals for reunion in South India, and on the general question of the ultimate reunion of Christendom, at once to say that there are wide differences between the Free Churches on this question. Their leaders who met the bishops at the Continuation Committee of the Lambeth Conference in the years between the Appeal to All Christian People, issued in 1920, and the World Conference of Faith and Order at Lausanne in 1927, were divided from one another by views as divergent as those of Archbishop Laud and Richard Baxter whilst the latter was still an ordained clergyman of the Church of England, or the beliefs of the late Lord Phillimore and Lord Halifax on the one hand, and the Bishop of Birmingham and Mr. Kensit on the other. Lest such a statement should discourage those who are working for unity, it will be necessary in this review of the situation to emphasise the fact that a great measure of reunion has taken place in Canada, resulting in the formation of the United Church of Canada, in which Presbyterians and Methodists who have a high view of the ministerial office have entered into union with Congregationalists who inherited the traditions of the Independents of Queen Elizabeth's reign. These descendants of Penry and Robinson have found it possible to join in an organised church with a definite credal basis and an unqualified acceptance of ordination of the ministry and a definite system of centralised church government which would have seemed utterly impossible to the early

Independent Elizabethan martyrs. It will therefore be necessary to deal sectionally with the Free Churches and to point out the difference which exists between the ecclesiastical schools represented by Presbyterianism, Methodism and the Lutheran and Reformed Churches of the Continent on the one hand, and the Independent school represented by Dr. J. D. Jones and Dr. Garvie on the other hand. These differences, it must be emphasised, have not prevented these two great leaders of modern Independency from entering in recent years into the discussions for advancing the cause of reunion on the basis of Episcopacy which have taken place between the bishops and the delegates of the Free Churches at Lambeth.

It has been suggested that in this statement there should be included some indication of the attitude of the Free Churches as a whole towards the South Indian proposals. As the Free Churchmen at Bangalore have succeeded in incorporating in the proposals the definite statement laid down in a Joint Committee after the Lambeth Conference that their ministries are 'real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacrament in the universal church,' and as they are not called upon to accept reordination as a condition of reunion, there is no doubt that the proposals of the Bangalore Conference will, if not seriously modified, be cordially welcomed by the overwhelming majority of Free Churchmen.

At the same time it is essential to say, and to emphasise the fact, that any modifications in the schemes which might be insisted upon at the Lambeth Conference of 1930 which in any way cast a doubt upon the validity of their ministry, would imperil the whole of these proposals from the standpoint of the Free Churches. There has already appeared, even in the conservative *Methodist Recorder*, a warning note that Methodism in this proposed scheme of reunion is called upon to sacrifice a large territory and a number of members who will become members of an Episcopal Communion and will cease in any modern sense of the word to be 'Methodists.' The *Christian World*, which represents to-day the inheritors of the Puritan tradition, has also taken a line by no means friendly to the present proposals, on the ground that they represent too great a sacrifice of principle and of territory on the part of Free Churchmen. Nevertheless the example of the Canadian churches encourages those who are supporting the proposals of Bangalore to believe that if the scheme, without serious modification, is sanctioned at Lambeth, it will be accepted by the governing bodies of the missionary societies representing Presbyterianism, Methodism and Congregationalism.

Anxiety has also been expressed by those who wished this chapter to be written as to what is or will be the attitude of the Free Churches in any such reunion, with regard to what is termed 'the elimination of Anglo-Catholicism.' It is right to say at once that on the Free Church side there is no thought of excommunication, even of those who differ from the ordinary Free Churchmen as widely as do the members of the Anglo-Catholic Congress and the English Church Union. Those who care enough for unity to enter into such discussions as have taken place at Bangalore and from year to year in the Federal Council of the Free Churches will be the last to ask that any scheme of union should exclude from the United Church of the future any who are willing to unite with them on the basis of the first three conditions of the Lambeth Quadrilateral and on the basis of the fourth condition as interpreted by the different schools of thought now included within the Church of England. The case of Dr. Orchard as a member of the Congregational Union vindicates these statements.

Some apprehension has also been expressed by members of the Church of England as to the attitude of the Free Churchmen with regard to the necessity of admitting the principle of intercommunion before an act of union takes place. This attitude is explained by the following passages in the report prepared by the Committee of the Federal Council of the Free Churches of England and issued to each of the Federated denominations on May 22, 1921: 'We ask our Anglican brethren, on their part, to welcome and to promote closer spiritual fellowship among the churches, especially through the pulpit, at the Communion Table, and in the work of the Kingdom. . . . That the Holy Spirit by His presence sanctions intercommunion, and indeed, precedes us in every step we take towards it, seems to us—and we think must seem to anyone looking impartially at the facts of Christendom—far more manifest than that He makes any particular form of order or policy essential in the Church. So we conclude that the immediate duty of the churches, in this high and sacred matter of reunion, is to unite in the fellowship of the Word and Sacrament of Christ's Gospel and in the work of the Gospel at home and abroad.' The general line insisting upon the importance of this question taken by Dr. Perowne, the Bishop of Bradford, finds no critics in the Free Churches. They remember with gratitude the service rendered to Christian Unity by Dr. Perowne's father, the Bishop of Worcester, in breaking down the barriers between the Church of England and the Free Churches when at Grindelwald in 1892 ; he administered the Communion to the members of the Conference without insisting upon the rubric which declares that those who communicate shall have been confirmed or be desirous of being confirmed. His action in so doing anticipated the decision of the Lambeth Conference in 1920 that the clergymen of the Church of England should not repel from Communion any who presented themselves. Nevertheless, it is right to say that the leaders of the Free Churches generally would recognise that inasmuch as every society and club has the right to insist upon conditions of membership applying to any who desire to enjoy the privileges of that society or club, this principle must apply *a fortiori* to a Church which decides that its rule shall be only to administer the Holy Communion to its own members. The Church of England has not been solitary in the past in this respect. At the service which the writer attended in Banff some twenty years ago, he was asked to retire to the gallery for children because the members of the Presbyterian Church at Banff received the Holy Communion, and that custom existed in the Presbyterian Church in the last century. At the same time all Free Churchmen now recognise that intercommunion between themselves is, in the words of the Bishop of Bradford, ' the recognition of Our Lord's one new commandment that He gave His disciples, " Love one another," and to that end they were bidden to continue this sacrament in remembrance of Him.'

To Free Churchmen generally in this generation the refusal of Communion to any who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth is a definite act of schism on the part of him who makes the refusal, and he is the real sufferer from that act. Nevertheless they would not take up the position that observance of the order laid down in the Church of England rubric seriously delays the reunion movement. They await with patience the time when under other conditions intercommunion shall no longer create a scandal in the minds of any of those for whose tender consciences in this matter they have respect, however little they may understand the grounds of such scruples.

Returning to our consideration of the attitude of the Free Churches towards Episcopacy, it is natural to take first the Methodist communion on both sides of the Atlantic, as being nearest to the Anglican position. The American Methodist Episcopal Church, which to-day numbers nearly nine million members and about forty thousand clergy, was founded by Coke, a presbyter of the Church of England, who was consecrated bishop or superintendent by John Wesley, and by Asbury, his colleague, whom Coke himself consecrated bishop or superintendent. The term ‘ bishop ’ was not applied to those two men by John Wesley, but was adopted by them, and inserted in the minutes of the Conference by Bishop Asbury. The whole constitution of the Methodist Episcopal Church definitely recognises the three offices, and has its separate forms for the consecration of a bishop and the ordination of presbyters and elders.

The power of these bishops is so great that it might well be the envy of the bishops of the churches in communion with Canterbury. In a conversation with Bishop James Cannon of the Methodist Episcopal Church South in the presence of a representative leader of Anglo-Catholicism, I asked him such questions as the following :

‘ If any minister of your Church expressed his failure to accept the Virgin Birth, what would you do with him ? ’

‘ I should not appoint him to a charge.’

‘ If any taught the Roman doctrine of the Eucharist, what would you do with him ? ’

‘ I should not appoint him.’

'If any insisted on placing a crucifix on the Communion Table, or placed in his church the stations of the Cross, what would you do?'

'Again, I should not appoint him.'

'If any wore vestments when celebrating, or a surplice in preaching, what would you do?'

'I should not appoint him.'

This conversation is recorded as an illustration of the remarkable fact that the whole patronage of the Church is vested in the bishops. In 1894 I was a member of the Swiss Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, being at that time a minister of that Church with liberty to reside in England without salary, and was present when the Bishop, Dr. Newman, summoned his 'Presiding Elders' or Archdeacons, to give him the necessary information that he might appoint, for the ensuing year, the whole of the Swiss clergy of that Church. He addressed them in these terms: 'What are you doing for the next two afternoons?' On their replying that they were engaged with committees, he said: 'Put these committees on one side. I shall require you to tell me what you know about each of the men, and it will be your duty to give me all the information you can, and then to accept my decision as obedient sons of the Gospel.'

A Roman prelate could scarcely claim more absolute power than is wielded by these bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church of America. In the Church of Rome the Pope has power to deal with bishops who wrongly use their great powers. In the Methodist Episcopal Church of America a committee, called 'The Committee on Episcopacy,' is formed under the Constitution, which has power to remove from his charge any bishop who takes action deserving such removal. This is a reasonable precaution. But it does not alter the fact that the Methodist Church in America is as definitely under episcopal government as any Church in Europe, Eastern or Western. The acceptance of episcopacy in any scheme of union would therefore most certainly have the strong support of Methodism in America.

Although Wesley declared his own belief that he was entitled to exercise episcopal powers, and that a bishop was only *primus inter pares*, he did not give to the chairman of districts the powers which are vested in the American Methodist bishops. At the same time the 'separated chairman' in England is actually bishop apart from the name, and if he were consecrated bishop in any United Church that act would not necessarily carry with it any extension of his powers. Speaking broadly, world-wide Methodism is already under a constitutional episcopacy, and the method of government presents no obstacle.

On the question of accepting reordination the Methodists stand generally with their fellow Free Churchmen in the numerous declarations affirming its general impracticability. Isolated cases may be found of Methodist ministers whose passion for unity has led them to say with Hugh Price Hughes that they might accept reordination as a part of a general scheme between high contracting parties, but such instances are rare. The overwhelming majority would repudiate any such condition. Even those who might take this very extreme measure would not do so because of any sense of a lack in their own ministerial standing. Not one Methodist minister in a thousand takes or contemplates taking Anglican orders because he disbelieves in the validity of his own ministry.

The Reformed Churches of France, Scotland, Germany, Scandinavia and North America vary greatly in their relation to Episcopacy. The Lutheran Churches exhibit the greatest diversity. The National Church of Sweden (Lutheran) has never lost its definite succession from the bishops who before the Reformation accepted the Papal Supremacy. The vestments at the service which is still known as 'High Mass,' used in the Cathedral of Upsala, date back to pre-Reformation times. The present Primate of Sweden, Dr. Soderblom, related to me an interesting story of the visit paid by the then Bishop of Rochester, after the Lambeth Conference of 1888, to his predecessor at the Palace at Upsala. When the card of the bishop was presented by his chaplain to the Primate, the latter is reported to have said, 'No, I cannot see him. His orders are doubtful, and his theology is too Calvinistic.' *Tempora mutantur nos et* *mutamur in illis.* Under the more Catholic rule of the present Primate many bishops of the English Church have been honoured guests at Upsala. The Churches of Norway and Finland, although Lutheran, are also episcopal in their government, but they distinctly repudiate any claim to a direct succession from the pre-Reformation bishops.

The situation in Germany is perhaps the most interesting of any of the Presbyterian Churches. The Church of the Old Prussian Union has seventeen Superintendents-General. In 1925 it was proposed by the General Synod that these seventeen important ecclesiastics, who in many ways exercised episcopal functions very much as do the Chairmen of the English Wesleyan Methodist Church, should henceforth be designated bishops. The question was considered by the Synod in December 1925, and as the voting was equal it was reconsidered at the next session. It was argued that the present designation, in German, one word, 'Generalsuperintendent,' would gain in dignity and clearness if the German 'Bischof,' familiar to every child through Luther's translation of the Bible, were adopted. The supporters of the proposal claimed that they did not mean to imply any material change affecting the democratic organisation of the Church. The opponents of the change urged that the historic associations of the word were so hierarchical in character that, whatever might be the intention of the promoters of this resolution, these tendencies would creep in, and that they were directly contrary to the foundation principles on which the Church was based. It was further urged that a bishop elected by the Synod for life would feel that his title carried with it not only ecclesiastical dignity but also a great deal of independence and considerable freedom of action in opposition to the lay influences in the Synod. The innovation was opposed unanimously by the members of the new Prussian provinces in the west, the Synods of which had been Presbyterian since the Reformation. Western sections held that the appointment of a Church President for a limited period is more compatible with the democratic tendencies desired to-day in church organisations.

On the other hand the friends of the innovation insist that what they desire is merely a change in designation and not an alteration in the functions and offices of the present Superintendent-General. They claim that the title 'Bischof,' by virtue of its familiar Biblical association, expresses more exactly that spiritual leadership which should characterise the ecclesiastical head of the Church or of the province of the Church. The title of Superintendent-General is reminiscent of government control, they held, while the very word 'Bischof' indicates that the Church is coming into her own at last. It was alleged that there was a great change in religious and moral feeling, and that there should be a man looked up to by ministers and laymen alike. He would be the representative of his Church with regard to the civil authorities and foreign Churches. His title would at once secure the recognition due to his place and function, as speaking in behalf of his Church: he would, in Dr. Deissmann's words, 'stand high up.' He would from his exalted place 'be able to send into all lands the waves of the Good Tidings.'

The project was ultimately rejected by a small majority, the resistance coming mostly from the reformed elements in the Rhineland where the democratic view is predominant, for the title 'Bischof' is too strong a reminder of Roman Catholicism. The Germans had, therefore, to console themselves, as hitherto, with the terms 'Generalsuperintendent' and 'Prelate,' which are other titles for the same thing, without, they held, that sacerdotal mysticism from which a doctrine of Apostolic Succession could be developed.

There the matter rests at present, although the influence of the Episcopal Lutheran Churches in Scandinavia, Jugoslavia and Saxony is a constant influence in the direction of admitting in phraseology what is a fact in ecclesiastical life.

In Scotland, which in the world stands out as one of the great Presbyterian nations, there are two distinct schools of thought. The Scottish Church Society represents the High Church element in Presbyterianism. It has been especially associated with the names of men like Dr. A. K. H. Boyd and Dr. Cooper, the Moderator of the Scottish Church, who himself preached in the crypt of St. Paul's. This Society has asserted recently in a special pamphlet that ‘ historical Presbyterianism in general and the Church of Scotland in particular stand by the doctrine of Apostolic Succession.’ A sentence in this pamphlet is quoted from Principal Hill, which claims Dominical institution for the ministry and says, ‘ we Presbyterians join with the Church of Rome and the Church of England in holding that the persons invested with Church government derive their powers not from the people but from Jesus Christ by His ministers.’ This Society in this pamphlet criticises vigorously the sentence in which the representatives of the Church of England and of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, assembled in the continuation committees following Lambeth in 1920, spoke of a ‘ ministry acceptable to a United Church through possessing the authority of the whole Church.’ The Society claims that the Church may recognise but it does not authorise. It quotes with approval a striking phrase of the late Lord Balfour of Burleigh that there is ‘ a *perpetua successio presbyterorum* from before the Reformation.’

Principal Rainy, in his famous reply to Dean Stanley, maintained that Presbyterianism was a system which developed the average member of the Church as Episcopacy had not done, teaching him to care for his Church and work for it as something of which he formed an integral part. Principal Rainy also pointed out in a very interesting sentence the fact that Presbyterianism so easily became Episcopacy—‘ there is at least one large Presbyterian Church, that of Hungary, which has bishops, and in other lands also it may be possible to combine the best features of the two systems.’

Scottish history for a century and a half after the Reformation furnishes a striking example of the way in which, under pressure from monarchs, the National Church passed from Presbyterianism into Episcopacy and back again, ultimately reverting to Presbyterianism. Canon Simpson (now Dean of Peterborough) contributed to *The Review of the Churches* for July 1928 a most valuable article entitled ‘ Scottish Episcopacy a Precedent for Reunion,’ in which he points out that the Church of Scotland finally reverted to Presbyterianism after the Revolution of 1689, because the bishops 'would not consent to serve William the Third as they had served his predecessors.' The Church of Scotland in 1690 assumed the form which it has since preserved, but it was not re-established after the Disestablishment of the Episcopal Church. What happened was that the bishops simply ceased to be one of the three estates of the realm. The recognition accorded to the General Assembly as the supreme governing body of the Church in 1592 and confirmed in 1597 was never withdrawn. The Crown silenced its voice by the simple expedient of not calling it together. When it was summoned in 1690 the Church Court became Presbyterian simply by the exclusion of the bishops. The canonical Episcopacy died out with the disappearance of the last pre-Reformation bishop and was reintroduced into Scotland in 1610, when Spottiswoode of Glasgow and his three colleagues returned to Scotland after having been consecrated at London House. They then consecrated the occupants of the nine remaining sees. It is a fact of the greatest possible interest at the present time to note that, when Bishop Andrewes expressed his doubt as to the consecration of these Presbyterian ministers without first being ordained, Bancroft in reply to his scruples alleged that 'there was no necessity for this, seeing that where bishops could not be had the ordination given by presbyters must be esteemed lawful.' Dean Simpson holds that this was the Anglican view of the matter. Bishop Gore declines to be bound by the action of Caroline bishops, but there can be no denial of the fact that again and again in the changes of 1610 to Episcopacy, then again of 1661 reverting to Episcopacy after the Presbyterian period, ministers who had only been ordained by presbyters were allowed to remain in the full discharge of their ministerial functions, and celebrated the Holy Communion in what was for the time being an Episcopal Church in communion with Canterbury, without reordination.

It is also important to note that Spottiswoode and his colleagues already held the offices for which they were consecrated before they left Scotland, and by the law and custom of their native land they were deemed the successors of those who had previously held the sees, the titles of which they bore. When they appeared before King James in London, he explained to them that the real purpose of his summons was that they might obtain what was no longer to be had in Scotland, a place in the historic succession. The famous Assembly of 1610 placed the Moderatorship of the Synods in the hands of the bishops.

Again in 1661, when Episcopacy was restored after the Commonwealth period, Sharp and Leighton, both of whom were Presbyterian ministers, were consecrated bishops. In their case ordination as deacon and priest was exacted as a condition of consecration. Nevertheless, it is generally recognised that neither Leighton nor Sharp himself made a practice of the reordination of the parish ministers in his diocese. Bishop Gilbert Burnet wrote in 1669, 'the Bishops of Scotland do not attempt the reordination of those whom Presbytery had ordained.' Dean Simpson is therefore justified in saying that, disastrous as the actual history of the Episcopacy of 1661 in Scotland proved, we may at least appeal to Anglicans to remember that a precedent already exists for the acceptance of non-Episcopal ministers without reordination. And the Dean further appeals to Free Churchmen who are prepared to accept the historic episcopate as part of a scheme of reconstruction to consider whether the method adopted in Scotland for incorporating an old order in a new model is not 'precisely what is calculated to realise their hopes without compromising their ideals.'

We enter an entirely different atmosphere when we come to deal with the Independents, who include both those who believe in adult baptism only and those who recognise the scriptural sanction for infant baptism. There is an immense difference between the Congregationalists who belong to the Congregational Union of to-day and the Independents of the Commonwealth period. Notwithstanding the direct succession of the one from the other, the mere formation of a union was in itself a repudiation of the principle of Independency—that each Church was absolutely self-governed and guided by the Spirit of Christ and that in any locality where a number of believers met together, there they formed the Christian Church of that place, subject to no other dominion save that of the Lordship of Christ. Churches which have joined themselves with other churches in a union exercising any power of control whatever over its members have largely lost this conception of the absolute independence of each joint church.

When we consider the reply of the Baptist Union and of the Congregational Union to the Lambeth Appeal to All Christian People, we find that the Baptist Union is not alarmed by the advocacy of a wider union, but ‘ recognises the guidance of the Spirit of God in the present movement towards Christian Unity. The Assembly feels that the movement has received a great impulse from the fraternal and sympathetic spirit of the Lambeth Conference, and especially in the idea of fellowship.’ Neither was the Congregational Union of that year, 1921, alarmed by the Lambeth Appeal, but desired to express ‘ sincere appreciation of the spirit that breathes through the Appeal.’ It went on to say, ‘ we share with the Bishops the desire for a closer fellowship among Christ’s people, and we assure the Archbishop that we shall labour together with him and with them to bring about the happy consummation when “ they all shall be one.” ’ The Union then proceeds to point out certain reasons which prevent them from accepting the definite proposals of the Appeal, emphasising their own ‘ historic witness in favour of the continuous guidance of the Spirit ’ and their belief that under that guidance ‘ the expression of that faith may and must vary from age to age.’ Strange to say, however, the Union does not criticise the difficulty presented in Episcopal government, but dwells with great emphasis upon the difficulty of State Establishment.

These replies, however bewildering they would have been to Oliver Cromwell and John Bunyan, are encouraging to those who hope that Episcopacy will present no insuperable barriers to ultimate union with the members of the Baptist and Congregational Unions. At the same time it is important to emphasise the fact that the Baptist Union of England has been largely influenced by that great Christian and Catholic, Dr. Shakespeare. From the standpoint of the Baptist of the days of John Bunyan he is really a *lusus* *naturae* in calling himself a Baptist Independent at all. Dr. T. R. Glover is, from this standpoint, the true unspoiled child of nature and grace. Similarly, in the Congregational Union the influence of Dr. J. D. Jones, the great Congregational preacher of Bournemouth, who, as the doyen of Congregationalism, signed with Dr. Scott Lidgett and Dr. Carnegie Simpson and other Free Churchmen the Report of the Joint Committee after the Lambeth Conference, must be regarded as having travelled far from the position of Independents of the days of Penry and Robinson. The true Independents to-day are men of the type of Dr. Barton, the great American Baptist, who found so much difficulty in falling into line in the discussions of the Lausanne Conference of Faith and Order, and Dr. C. C. Morrison, the brilliant but somewhat intransigent editor of *The Christian Century*. Men of this type, Dr. Barton, Dr. Glover and Dr. Morrison, are the real heirs of the Commonwealth spirit, but they do not represent the modern tendency of Congregationalism. This tendency is, more and more, to give increasing power to the Union and to recognise the value of such ecclesiastics as the Methodist Chairman of a District and the Presbyterian Moderators of Synods. In accepting the institution of 'Moderators' of District Synods, they have advanced towards a practical Episcopacy.

The fact that in Canada the Congregationalists have, without any dissentient congregations, joined in the union of the United Church of Canada and accepted a system based upon Methodist and Presbyterian ideals with a definitely centralised government and with men exercising superintendency over a number of churches, shows how far the modern Congregationalist has found it possible to travel towards Episcopacy in practice. The same thing has happened in South India, where the South India United Church is the result of a movement which has brought into organic union the Presbyterian Churches established by British and American missionaries, and the missions belonging to the Reformed Churches in Germany and Switzerland, with missions established by the London Missionary Society of the British Congregational Union and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, which is the great American Congregational Missionary Society. The South India United Church has now expressed its approval of the scheme for union on an Episcopal basis with the Church of England in South India.

On a review of the whole situation it is sufficiently clear from the foregoing facts that Episcopacy as a factor in Church government, apart from the theory of Apostolic Succession, does not to-day present any definite obstacle to union between the Church of England, the Presbyterian Church, the Wesleyan Methodist Church and the Congregationalists as a whole. Let this question be approached in the Catholic spirit of Bishop Brent's great statement in his sermon at Lausanne in 1927, 'We come for conference, not controversy.' Let the object be comprehension, not compromise, and there seems no reason in the attitude of these Churches why satisfactory and permanent union should not be effected.

The Roman Church has found it possible to include in its embrace Platonist and Aristotelian, or, in mediaeval phraseology, Scotist and Thomist. Among Protestants the division between Calvinist and Arminian a hundred years ago was so wide and so deep that few would have believed synthesis was possible ; few would have dreamed that those who emphasised the sovereignty of God and those who rejoiced in the free will of man would have found it possible to be comprehended in one Church, but this philosophic barrier has been entirely overcome.

The real question that now confronts those who seek for unity is whether it is possible to unite in one organic union those who believe in the transmission of grace through an unbroken succession from the Apostles with those who claim a grace given to their ministry direct from their Lord and Master and refuse to accept a theory of the ministry which denies the grace manifestly bestowed upon many who can claim no succession through any line of prelates. If comprehension between two such different schools of thought can be found possible without either side denying the truth for which they contend, the question of Episcopacy need be no barrier to union.

INDEX

ABERDEEN, 130, 148, 182
Abergwili, 122
Åbo, 321, 331
Acts of the Apostles, 8, 9, 11, 14, 29, 357
Adelaide, 253, 254
Adrian di Castello, Bishop of Hereford and Bath and Wells, 83
Africa, 53, 381 n.
Albany, 166
Alexander III, Emperor, 331
Alexandria, 52, 53, 57, 58, 310, 316, 356
Algoma, 174
Ambrosiaster, 59, 356
America, U.S.A., 147–173, 250, 251, 269, 298, 327, 333, 341, 360, 363–365, 368, 375, 382, 385, 393, 400
Amsterdam, 336
Ananias, 14
Ancyra (Council), 51, 58 n.
Anderson, Bishop of Rupertsland, 184
Andrewes, Bishop, 397
Anskar, St., 321
Antigua, 225, 226, 229, 230, 234–236, 366
Antioch (Pisidia), 63
Antioch (Syria), 2, 15, 16, 18, 27, 37, 38, 42, 51, 53–55, 310, 316, 349
Apostles, 2, 14, 15, 17, 20, 23, 26, 27 n., 30, 31, 34–37, 39, 41–44, 48, 53, 215, 223, 224, 291, 292, 329
Apostles (Jewish), 2, 3
Apostolic Canons, 51, 52
Apostolic Church Order, 61
Apostolic Constitutions, 50–52, 57–60, 61 n., 62, 64, 65, 66
Apostolical Succession, 6, 16, 31, 39, 42, 45, 46, 129, 137, 148, 149, 199, 223, 273, 287, 292, 308, 323–325, 327–329, 331, 332, 337, 341, 342, 344–359, 361, 377, 386, 394–396, 398, 401
Aquiba, R., 7
Arabia, 53
Archbishops, 82, 86, 87, 91, 94, 115, 117, 123–127, 168, 170, 174, 228, 263, 266, 273, 274, 276, 278, 297, 299, 300, 331, 332, 335–337. *See also* Metropolitans.
Archdeacons, 73–75, 100, 118, 120, 122, 225, 229, 248, 252, 392
Arcimboldi, 322
Arius, 55, 58
Arles, Councils of, 51, 55, 60
Armagh, 138, 139, 141
Armidale, 256, 259
Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, 77
Asbury, 364 n., 368, 391
Asia Minor, 2, 33, 34, 38, 47
Assam, 203
Assembly Diocesan (Roumania), 320
Assistant Bishops, 121, 154, 155, 206, 243
Athabasca, 176
Athanasius, St., 49, 55, 58 n., 65
Athens, 317
Auckland, 264
Augsburg Confession, 323, 325, 327
Augustana Synod, 327
Augustine, St., of Canterbury, 82, 88, 204
Augustine, St., of Hippo, 59, 65, 67–72, 336, 341
Austin, Bishop of Guiana, 236, 237
Australia, 184, 187, 188, 202, 250–261, 298
Austria, 298, 337, 339
Autocephalous Churches, 305, 310, 311, 315, 319
Azariah, Bishop of Dornakal, 203

BABYLONIA, 7
Balfour of Burleigh, Lord, 345 n., 396
Ballarat, 258
Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, 397
Bangalore, 388, 389
Bangor, 116
Baptists, 398–400
Barbados, 225–228, 230–234, 236, 239, 240, 242
Barker, Bishop of Sydney, 257

Barnabas, St., 3, 15, 16, 18, 37, 48, 53, 63
Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham, 387
Barsumas, 55
Barton, Dr., 400
Bartos, 371
Basil, St., 62
Basilides, 49
Bath and Wells, See of, 83
Bathurst, 256
Baxter, R., 387
Baynes, Bishop of Natal, 271
Beaufort, H., Bishop of Winchester, 83
Bede, St., 82
Belfast, 137, 138
Belgrade, 318
Benson, Archbishop of Canterbury, 112, 119
Berkeley, 231
Bernard, Chancellor, 324
Berne, 339
Beryllus, Bishop of Bostra, 53
Binney, Bishop of Nova Scotia, 184
Birgitta, St., 321
Black Prince, 85
Bloemfontein, 286
Bombay, 202, 203, 206, 207
Bonner, Bishop of London, 83
Borga, 331
Boston, 162
Boyd, Dr. A. K. H., 395
Bradacius, M., Moravian bishop, 371, 372
Brandon, 176
Brent, Bishop of the Philippines, 153, 158, 401
Brisbane, 256
British Columbia, 174, 178, 180
Brooks, Phillips, Bishop of Massachusetts, 158, 159
Broughton, Bishop of Sydney, 187, 252, 253, 255–257
Bruce, Robert, 350
Bruno, of Cologne, 85
Bulgaria, 319
Bunbury, 258
Bunyan, J., 399
Bythner, J., Bishop, 370

CÆSAREA, 17
Calcutta, 202, 203, 205–207, 212, 252, 269
Caledonia, 180
Calgary, 176
Callaway, Bishop of St. John's, Kaffraria, 286
Calvin, J., 325, 349, 357, 358
Calvinism, 323, 326, 335, 349, 357, 358, 363, 393, 401
Campeggio, Lorenzo, Bishop of Salisbury, 83
Canada (Dominion), 88, 174–199, 250, 269, 298, 387, 389, 400; United Church of, 387, 400
Canada (Province), 174, 175, 193
Canons (Cathedral), 78, 79, 90–94, 118, 119, 122, 123, 140, 166, 228, 298, 300, 335, 336
Canterbury, See of, 74, 87, 91, 94, 110, 112, 114–116, 125–127, 138, 184, 185, 187, 188, 190, 203, 204, 207, 226–228, 231, 242, 254, 257, 264, 271, 273, 274, 311, 324, 340, 397, 399
Cape Colony, 268, 271, 285
Cape Town, 269–273, 275, 279, 285–287
Cappadocia, 54
Cardinals, 72, 74
Cariboo, 180
Carolina, South, 152
Carpentaria, 258
Carthage, 54, 55
Cathedrals, 88, 140, 166, 172, 177, 180, 226, 230, 256, 257, 275, 332
Caulfield, Bishop of Nassau, 241
Cech, A., Old Catholic Bishop-elect, 339
Celtic Church, 209, 380
Ceylon, 202, 207
Chalcedon, 52, 56
Chancellor, 73, 76, 109, 110
Chapter. *See* Canons.
Charles I, King, 269, 345, 346, 353
Charles II, King, 345, 352
Charles IX, King of Sweden, 323
Chase, Bishop of Ohio, 153
Chicago, 166, 375
China, 327
Chlumec, 371
Choto Nagpur, 203
Christchurch (New Zealand), 262, 264
Christian II, King, 321, 322
Cilicia, 53
Clark, Bishop of Rhode Island, 158
Clarke, Adam, 362
Clarke, Presiding Bishop (U.S.A.), 169
Clement I, St., 28–33, 39, 40, 42, 48
Clement VII, Pope, 82
Clement, Ep. ii, 58
Clergy, relation to Bishop, 57–62, 69, 70, 98–104, 109, 113, 118, 161, 164, 165, 171, 172, 204, 221–223, 231–240, 254, 260, 275, 281–284, 380, 391, 392
Coadjutor Bishops, 154–156, 170, 190, 205, 243

Cochran, W., Archdeacon, 177
Codde, Archbishop of Utrecht, 336
Coke, T., 364–366, 368, 391
Colenso, Bishop of Natal, 273
Coleridge, Bishop W. H., 226, 227
Collegiate Episcopate, 31, 38, 40, 292, 377
Colluthus, 58
Colombo, 202, 207, 208
Comenius, 370
Commissaries, 73, 198, 226, 244, 275
Committee of Reference, English (West Indies), 229, 243, 245, 246
Concelebration, 59
Conference, Bishops' (Old Catholic), 339
Conference : Diocesan, 102, 108, 113, 116, 117, 125, 184 ; Wesleyan, 366–369, 391
Confirmation of Election, 50, 78, 79, 90, 91, 117, 125, 126, 130, 141, 157, 159, 167, 170, 197, 228–230, 263, 275, 297, 298
Confirmation, Sacrament of, 58, 59, 76, 99, 100, 104, 121, 143, 151, 209, 210, 221, 260, 269, 293, 329, 330, 333, 339, 362 n., 384, 385, 390
Congregationalism, 152, 349, 360, 387, 389, 398–401
Connecticut, 148, 152
Connolly, R. H., 49, 58 n.
Consecration, 39, 49–51, 82, 91, 109, 148, 149, 210, 260, 272, 273, 275, 287, 291–293, 297–299, 308, 322, 325, 327, 328, 331, 332, 336–341, 352, 368, 370–372, 377, 382, 393, 397, 398 ; *per saltum*, 352, 353
Constantinople, 55, 56, 310, 315, 316, 319, 339
Constitutional Episcopacy, 101, 113, 263, 267, 268, 275, 276, 281
Convention, General (U.S.A.), 147, 149, 150, 153, 156, 159, 160, 164, 375, 376, 382, 385
Convocation, 82, 94–97, 101, 107, 112, 132, 143, 184, 202, 376
Cooper, Dr., 395
Copleston, Bishop of Calcutta, 204, 208
Coptic Church, 316
Corinth, 14, 18, 20, 21, 28–31, 38, 377
Corinthians, Ep. i, 20–22
Cornelius, Centurion, 64
Cornelius, St., Pope, 49, 54
Corrie, Bishop of Madras, 202, 269
Cotterill, H., Bishop, 287
Cotton, Bishop of Calcutta, 204, 212, 213
Council, Consultative (Scotland), 133–135
Council, Diocesan, 161, 207, 208, 210, 216, 221–223, 229, 230, 232, 237, 238, 246, 248
Council, General (India), 208, 216–218, 220, 222, 223
Council, Representative Church (Scotland), 131, 132
Councils, General, 218, 219, 307
Courtenay, Coadjutor Bishop of Kingston (Jamaica), 242, 245
Courts, Church, 74, 94, 109–112, 127, 128, 135, 145, 146, 149, 160, 162, 167, 170, 194, 198, 217, 222, 235, 238, 240, 249, 257, 271, 272, 279, 300, 301, 343, 397
Coxe, Bishop of Western New York, 158
Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, 101
Creighton, Bishop of London, 83
Cromwell, Oliver, 399
Crown, Powers and Influence of the, 78, 79, 83, 90–94, 114, 159, 184, 186, 190, 191, 207, 262, 271, 272, 317, 332, 335, 397
Cyprian, St., 48, 49, 53, 54, 66, 115, 381 n.
Cyprus, 310, 312
Czecho-Slovakia, 332, 337, 339

Damaraland, 280, 286, 287
Darius, 3
Davies, Bishop of Antigua, 234
Deans (Cathedral), 75, 78, 90, 93, 118, 119, 140, 166, 229, 248, 274, 326 ; of Diocese, 129, 130 ; of Province, 82 ; Rural, 75, 76, 100, 118, 119
Deissmann, A., 395
Delaware, 152
Denmark, Danes, 321, 322, 325, 327, 331
Derby, 89
Deventer, 335, 337, 338
Didache, 1, 26–28, 37, 38, 48, 57
Didascalia, 5, 381 n. ; Arabic, 50 ; Ethiopic, 51, 58, 65 ; Older, 57, 60, 64, 65
Diotrephes, 25
Dispensation, 221, 294, 301–303
Dmitri, Patriarch of Yugo-Slavia, 318
Dominica, 225
Donaldson, now Bishop of Salisbury, 260
Donatists, 342
Dornakal, 203
Down (with Connor and Dromore), See of, 138
Dublin, 138–140
Dunedin, 264

Durham, 94
Dutch Reformed Church, 276
Dwâné, 277, 278

Economy, 310, 315
Edmonton, 176
Egypt, 8, 34 n., 62
Election, 78, 79, 90, 116, 117, 124, 125, 129, 130, 139–141, 148, 157–159, 167, 190, 195, 197, 207, 227–232, 243, 244, 257, 263, 273–276, 298, 316–320, 332, 338, 368
Elias of Chrenow, 372
Elizabeth, Queen, 186, 325, 387, 388
Elvira, Synod of, 55, 61 n., 65
England, 77, 83–85, 87–113, 129, 138, 148, 185, 202, 252, 298, 326, 340, 364, 366–368, 370, 387, 389, 396, 399, 401
Epaphroditus, 3
Ephesians, Ep., 22, 358
Ephesus, 25 n., 33, 42, 55, 56
Ephrem Syrus, 61
Estates, Swedish, 322
Estonia, 332
Etheria, 58
Ethiopia, Order of, 278
Ethiopian Church, 277, 278
Eucharist, Holy, 21, 26, 30, 41, 57, 58, 60, 62–66, 132, 161, 165, 235, 301, 308, 327–331, 346, 356, 357, 361, 364, 367, 375, 378, 380–382, 384–386, 389–392, 397
Euodius, Bishop of Antioch, 38
Eusebius, 52, 53 n., 54 n., 55 n., 64 n.
Eutyches, 55
Exarch, 319
Excommunication, 109, 221, 222, 272, 322, 337, 340, 371, 389
Exempt Monasteries, 80, 295–297, 300, 313, 314
Exeter, 101

Faculty, 301–303, 311
Feild, Bishop of Newfoundland, 184
Ferns, 140
Finland, 321, 322, 331, 394
Firmillian, 54, 66
Fogarty, Bishop of Damaraland, 287
Forbes, P., Bishop, 354
France, 337, 339, 393
Fredericton, 174
French, Bishop of Lahore, 214
Friends, Society of, 381
Fulford, Bishop of Montreal, 184, 191

Gallican Statutes, 50–52, 60 n., 64, 65
Garden City, 166
Garvie, A. E., 388
Gaul, 59
Gaul, T. W., Bishop, 288
Gell, Bishop of Madras, 205, 213
General Assembly (Scotland), 344, 346, 350, 351, 397
George, Diocese of, 286
George IV, King, 227
Germany, 85, 325, 337–340, 393–395, 400
Gifford, Godfrey, Bishop of Worcester, 77
Giraldus Cambrensis, 121
Gladstone, W. E., 131, 132, 188
Glendalough, 139, 140
Glover, T. R., 400
Gore, late Bishop of Oxford, 52 n., 58 n., 66 n., 91 n., 92, 397
Göteborg, 331, 332
Goulburn, 256
Governing Body (Church in Wales), 117–119, 121, 123–126
Grafton, 256, 259
Grahamstown, 270, 271, 285, 286
Grandisson, John de, of Exeter, 81
Gray, Bishop of Bristol, 269
Gray, Bishop of Cape Town, 269–273, 285–287
Greece, Greeks, 314–318
Green, Bishop (now of Bangor), 119
Gregory (Moravian), 372
Gregory, St., the Great, 59, 82
Gregory, St., of Nazianzus, 49
Gregory VII, Pope, 77
Gregory IX, Pope, 77
Grenada, 225, 231
Griswold, Bishop, 152
Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, 72
Grub, Professor, 135, 353 n.
Guiana, British, 225–227, 229, 230, 232, 236–241
Gul, Archbishop of Utrecht, 340
Gustaf III, 326
Gustaf Vasa, King, 322, 323, 331

Haarlem, 335, 337, 338
Hale, Bishop of Perth, 256
Halifax, Lord, 387
Hall, J., chaplain, 200
Harding, Bishop, 213
Hasse, Bishop, 370, 371
Heber, Bishop of Calcutta, 202, 209
Hebrews, Ep. to, 24
Hellenism, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 19, 42
Henry III, Emperor, 72
Henry VIII, King, 93, 121, 186
Henson, Bishop of Durham, 324
Hereford, 83, 84
Hermas. *See* Shepherd.
Hernösand, 331
Herrnhut, 370, 371 n.

Heykamp, Bishop of Deventer, 337
Hezekiah, 2
Hill, Principal, 396
Hippolytus, 49, 52, 58, 60 ; Apostolic tradition of, 49, 52, 58–60, 62 n. ; Canons of, 50, 52, 58, 59 ; Constitutions through, 62
Hobart, Bishop of New York, 131, 152, 158
Holland, 335–338, 340, 345
Holme, Bishop of Honduras, 242
Homage, 79, 94
Honduras, 241, 242, 244, 248, 249
Hopkins, Bishop of Vermont, 158, 162
Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, 55
Hoskins, 364
Howley, Archbishop of Canterbury, 227, 269
Hugh, St., 81
Hughes, H. Price, 393
Hungary, 396
Huntingdon, Countess of, Connexion, 364
Huron, 174, 190, 192
Hus, 355
Hypnopsychites, 53

IGNATIUS, St., of Antioch, 33, 34, 39, 42, 53, 57, 70, 115, 172, 378, 380, 381 n.
Income, episcopal, 89, 90, 121, 122, 151, 158, 172
Independency, 18, 43, 344, 355, 387, 388, 398–400
India, 200–224, 259, 327, 331, 332, 387, 388, 400, 401
Innocent III, 78
Institution, 102–105, 135, 142, 155, 163, 164, 196–197, 282, 297, 299, 300, 312, 328
Ireland, 59, 136–146, 259, 367, 368
Irenaeus, St., 72
Isidore, of Seville, 65
Islep, Archbishop of Canterbury, 85
Italy, Italians, 24 n., 83, 322

JABLONSKI, Daniel, 370 ; Peter, 370
Jamaica, 240, 242–246
James I and VI, 345, 346, 352, 353, 398
James II and VII, 345
James, Bishop of Calcutta, 269
James, St., 15, 17, 36, 44, 53 ; Epistle of, 25
Jansen, C., 336, 337
Jansenism, 336
Jeduda b. Baba, R., 7
Jehoshaphat, 2
Jerome, St., 58, 63 n., 65, 209, 229, 356
Jerusalem, 2–4, 6, 9, 13–17, 34, 36–39, 41, 44, 53, 58, 310, 317
Jesuits, 336
Joachim III, Patriarch of Constantinople, 318
Joel, 10
Johannesburg, 286
John, elder, 25, 42
John, St., 14 ; Epp. ii and iii, 25
Johnson, Bishop of Calcutta, 205
Jones, Bishop of Cape Town, 272, 287
Jones, J. D., 388, 400
Joshua, 7, 11–13
Joshua b. Levi, R., 7
Jugo-Slavia. *See* Yugo-Slavia.
Jurisdiction, 2, 80, 81, 121, 193, 210, 221, 292–302, 328, 329, 338, 362 n., 364, 368
Jus liturgicum, 81, 82, 106, 107, 117, 162, 164, 165, 217, 219, 220, 247, 248, 279, 305, 311, 312, 391, 392
Justin Martyr, St., 57, 62, 63

KALGOORLIE, 258
Kalmar, 331 ; Union of, 321
Karlstadt, 331
Keewatin, 176
Kemper, J., Bishop, 153
Kensit, J., 387
Key, B. L., Bishop, 288
Kildare, 139, 140
Kimberley and Kuruman, 275, 286
King, Bishop of Lincoln, 92, 112
King, Lord Chancellor, 361, 362
Kip, Bishop of California, 166
Knox, John, 345–349, 360
Kootenay, 180
Koranda, W., 372
Kostka, J., 371, 372
Koven, De, 159
Kunwald, 371, 372
Kuopio, 331

LAHORE, 203, 207, 214
Laity, position of, 28, 29, 49–57, 62–66, 109, 113, 118, 130–134, 140–148, 150–152, 157, 159, 165, 167, 186–189, 194, 195, 218, 231–241, 245–247, 249, 253, 254, 263, 274, 278–281, 284, 285, 295, 315, 343, 344
Lambeth Conference, 188, 268, 279, 324, 340, 375, 376, 387–390, 393, 396, 399 ; Quadrilateral, 376, 389
Laodicea, 51
Lateran Council, Fourth, 78
Latvia, 332
Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, 273, 387
Laurence, of Somercote, 78, 79

Lebombo, 280, 286
Leeward Islands, 225
Lefroy, Bishop of Lucknow and Calcutta, 208, 219
Leighlin, 140
Leighton, Archbishop, 398
Letters Patent, 78, 90, 182, 185, 191, 198, 204, 206, 207, 225–228, 232, 236, 241, 252, 262, 270–272
Lhota, 372
Lhota, Synod of, 370, 371
License, 102, 105, 109, 142, 196, 197, 208, 233, 279
Lichfield, 88
Lidgett, J. Scott, 400
Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham, 50 n., 52 n., 58 n., 64 n.
Linköping, 321
Lipscomb, Bishop of Jamaica, 240, 244, 245
Livingstone, D., 287
Lloyd George, D., 91
Longley, Archbishop of Canterbury, 264, 376
Lord's Supper. *See* Eucharist, Holy.
Lowth, Bishop of London, 363
Lucknow, 203, 207
Luke, St., 4, 8–10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 37
Luleå, 331
Lund, 331
Luther, 325, 328, 330, 355, 394
Lutheranism, 315, 323, 324, 327, 329, 331, 360, 388, 393–395

MACHRAY, Archbishop of Rupertsland, 177, 178, 193
McIlvaine, Bishop of Ohio, 158
Mackenzie, Bishop, U.M.C.A., 287
Mackenzie River, 176
Macrorie, Bishop of Natal, 286, 287
Madras, 202, 203, 205–207, 213
Magnesia, 33, 41
Magni, Petrus, Bishop, 322
Malchion, 54
Mariaviten, 341
Martial, 49
Martin, St., 71
Maryland, 147, 148, 152, 154, 161
Mashonaland. *See* Rhodesia, Southern.
Mason, A. J., 324, 326 n.
Mass. *See* Eucharist, Holy.
Massachusetts, 151, 159
Mather, Wesleyan Minister, 366
Matheson, Archbishop of Rupertsland, 177
Mathew, Bishop, 340–342
Matthias of Kunwald, 372
Matthias, St., 10
Meade, Bishop, 154
Medley, Bishop of Fredericton, 174
Meindaerts, Archbishop of Utrecht, 337
Melanchthon, 325
Melanesia, 262, 265, 266
Melbourne, 253
Melville, A., 345, 350
Merriman, Bishop, 287
Methodism, 343, 359–369, 387–389, 391–393, 400, 401 ; Primitive, 360, 369 n.
Methodist Episcopal Church, 277, 360, 368, 391–393
Metropolitans, 25 n., 72, 82, 129, 168, 170, 184–187, 190, 192, 193, 197–199, 203, 207, 208, 218, 219, 253, 257, 271–274, 276, 286, 287, 299, 300, 311, 315, 316, 319. *See also* Archbishops.
Micklem, P. A., 259
Middleton, Bishop of Calcutta, 202, 212
Miletus, 17
Milman, Bishop of Calcutta, 202–206
Missionary bishops (U.S.A.), 153, 154, 156, 168, 170
Mitchell, Bishop, 353
Mitchell, Bishop of Aberdeen, 135
Mitchinson, Bishop of Barbados, 230–232 ; and the Windward Islands.
Moffatt, Dr., 343
Montana, 155
Montanism, 65, 66
Montreal, 174, 183
Montserrat, 225
Moore, Bishop of Virginia, 152
Moore, Wesleyan Minister, 366
Moosonee, 176
Moravians. *See* Unitas Fratrum.
Morrison, C. C., 400
Moses, 6, 7, 11–13, 35
Mountain, Bishop of Quebec, 183, 184, 186, 187, 189
Muratorian, Canon, 31

NAGPUR, 203, 207
Nasik, 203
Nassau, 241, 243, 247, 248
Natal, 270, 271, 285
National Assembly of the Church of England, 96, 97, 107, 132, 208
Nelson, 262
Netherlands. *See* Holland.
Nevis, 225
New England, 148, 149, 152, 159, 355
New Guinea, 257, 258
New London, 151
New South Wales, 255, 256, 258
New Westminster, 180
New York, 151, 152, 155, 166

New Zealand, 88, 184, 188, 252–254, 262–267
Newcastle (Australia), 253
Newfoundland, 366
Newman, Methodist bishop, 392
Nexus, legal, 252, 259
Nicaea, 50, 52, 55–57, 59 n., 60, 65
Nichols, Bishop of California, 166
Nitschmann, D., Bishop, 370
Nixon, Bishop of Tasmania, 269
Non-Jurors, 148
North, Sir Francis, 84
North-West Australia, 258
Norway, 321, 325, 327, 394
Norwich, 74
Nova Scotia, 174, 175, 181
Nuelsen, 366
Numbers, 11, 13
Nuttall, Bishop of Honduras, 242

Obedience, 87, 102, 109, 111, 165, 168, 226, 257, 271, 272, 282, 287
Ochrida, 319
Odo Rigaldi, Archbishop of Rouen, 77
Old Believers, 309
Old Roman Catholics, 341
Ontario, 174, 175, 190, 198
Orchard, W. E., 389
Ordinary, 268, 302
Ordination, 6, 7, 10–16, 17 n., 23, 24, 27, 29, 31, 33–35, 39, 42, 43, 47, 48, 50, 51, 58–60, 99, 121, 143, 151, 160, 221, 269, 271, 283, 291, 293, 308, 309, 325, 326, 328, 329, 332, 333, 339, 340, 344, 345, 348–353, 356, 359 n., 360–369, 371, 372, 382, 398
Origen, 53, 64
Orthodox, Eastern, 209, 305–320, 371, 376, 379, 383–385
Ossory, 140
Otey, Bishop of Tennessee, 153
Ottawa, 174
Otto, Bishop of Bamberg, 74
Owen, Bishop of St. David's, 122

Palestine, 7, 25, 34, 36, 37, 42, 53
Pallium, 72, 300
Parity of Ministers, 203, 204, 254, 259, 319, 343, 370
Parliament, 82, 94–98, 107, 108, 111, 178, 188–190
Parnas, 5, 12
Parry, Bishop of Barbados, 232
Pastoral Epistles, 23, 24, 29, 38, 42, 47, 48, 58
Patriarch, Œcumenical, 305, 310, 311, 314–317, 319
Patriarchs, 301, 311, 316–319
Patronage, 102, 103, 114, 115, 120, 121, 124, 141, 163, 194–196, 233, 238, 241, 246, 249, 281–283, 312, 348, 391, 392
Paul of Samosata, 54
Paul, St., 2, 3, 6, 14–19, 21–23, 28, 29, 37–39, 42, 44, 47, 48, 53, 63, 64, 349
Paulicians, 371
Pawson, Wesleyan Minister, 365 n., 366
Pecham, Archbishop of Canterbury, 75, 76
Penang, 209
Pennsylvania, 147, 148, 152, 155
Penry (Independent), 387, 400
Perowne, Bishop of Bradford, 390
Perowne, Bishop of Worcester, 390
Perry, Bishop of Melbourne, 253–256
Perth (Australia), 256, 258
Peter Damiani, St., 71
Peter of Chelcic, 372
Peter of Rochester, 74
Peter, St., 14, 15, 28, 37, 53, 64, 301; Ep. i, 25
Petri, Laurentius, Archbishop of Upsala, 322, 323, 326, 328
Petri Olaus, 323
Petrus Rogerii, 74
Phanar, 316–319
Philadelphia (Asia Minor), 33; (U.S.A.) 147, 151
Philip, St., 12, 14, 17, 22
Philip II, King, 335
Philippi, 25, 27, 38
Philippians, Ep. to, 1, 19, 52 n.
Phillimore, Lord, 387
Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter, 101
Poland, Poles, 338, 370
Polycarp, St., 33, 34, 50
Polynesia, 265
Poole, R. L., 85
Pope, 72, 73, 75, 77, 79, 83, 139, 209, 291, 293–303, 307, 311, 322, 337, 338, 355, 361, 379, 380, 392, 393
Porteus, Bishop of London, 251
Possidius, 67–70
Potter, A., Bishop, 158
Potter, Archbishop of Canterbury, 370
Potter, H., Bishop, 158
Praemunire, 90
Prague, 372
Presbyterianism, 43, 137, 152, 292, 309, 327, 343–360, 362, 365, 368, 369, 387–390, 395–398, 400–401
Presiding Bishop (U.S.A.), 155, 162, 168–170, 172
Pretoria, 286
Primates, 87, 88, 138, 139, 177, 198, 199, 228, 242, 246, 331, 393, 394
Prime Minister, 90–93, 140, 227

Primus (Scottish Church), 127, 129, 135
Privy Council, 110, 111, 117, 257, 271, 272, 279
Procurators, 317, 319
Propaganda, Congregation of, 336
Prophets, 11, 13–17, 20–22, 26, 31, 34–37, 45, 46, 48, 358
Province, 87, 115, 170, 174, 193, 199, 203–205, 207, 218–220, 230, 264, 265, 272, 275–277, 292, 299, 300
Provoost, Bishop, 149, 151, 166
Prussia, 298, 370, 394
Pseudo-Pionius, 50
Puller, Fr. F. W., 77

Qu'Appelle, 176
Quebec, 174, 175, 178, 184, 186–189
Queensland, 258
Quignon, 82

Rainy, Principal, 396
Rangoon, 203, 207
Rankin, 366
Rawle, Bishop of Trinidad, 230, 239
Reinkens, J. H., Bishop, 337
Reiser, F., Waldensian Bishop, 371
Religious, relation to Bishop, 295, 296, 313, 314
Resignation, 167, 168, 170, 198
Rhodes, 8
Rhodesia, Southern, 275, 280, 286
Richard, St., 78
Riverina, 258
Robertson, Bishop, 70
Robinson, J. A., 385, 386
Robinson, Independent, 387, 400
Rockhampton, 258
Roe, Sir T., 200
Rokycana, Utraquist Archbishop of Prague, 372
Romans, Ep. to, 21
Rome, 24 n., 28, 31–34, 38, 55, 57 n., 58, 83, 321, 322, 324–326, 336, 337, 339, 340, 376–379, 381 n., 383, 396, 401
Rome, Bishop of. *See* Pope.
Rotterdam, 337
Roumania, 319, 320
Rowe, Bishop of Alaska, 153
Rupertsland, 174, 176, 177, 183, 193, 197
Russia, 309, 331
Rutherford, S., Professor, 355
Ryle, H., Bishop, 324

St. Alban's, 88
St. Asaph, 121, 122
St. Christopher, 225
St. David's, 116
St. Helena, 286
St. John's, Kaffraria, 286
St. Lucia, 225, 231
St. Vincent, 225, 231
Salisbury, 83
Samaria, 12, 14, 22
San Francisco, 166
Sanhedrin, 6, 7, 17
Sardica, Council of, 51
Saskatchewan, 176
Saul. *See* Paul, St.
Scandinavia, 393, 395
Scotland, 129–135, 259, 344–356, 365, 366, 393, 395–398
Scott, Bishop, 153
Seabury, 147–149, 151, 152
Selwyn, Bishop of New Zealand, 184, 188, 254, 262, 264
Selwyn, E. G., 350 n., 356
Septuagint, 3, 4, 12, 17
Serbia, 318. *See also* Yugo-Slavia.
Seven, The, 12, 14, 15, 17, 42, 47, 215
Seventy, The, 13
Seymour, Bishop of Springfield, 159
Shakespeare, J. H., 399
Sharp, Archbishop of St. Andrews, 390
Shepherd (Hermas), 31–33
Short, Bishop of Adelaide, 254, 256
Silvia. *See* Etheria.
Simpson, Carnegie, 349 n., 400
Simpson, Dean of Peterborough, 396–398
Singapore, 209
Skaro, 321
Skinner, Bishop of Aberdeen, 131
Smeton, T., 350
Smith, Bishop of Maryland, 148
Smyrna, 33, 34
Socnopaeus, 8
Socrates, 55
Soderblom, Archbishop of Upsala, 393, 394
Sofia, 319
Sommar, Bishop of Strengnäs, 322
South Africa, 88, 250, 251, 259, 268–289, 327
South Australia, 258
Southwark, 88
Sozomen, 55, 57, 58
Spain, 59, 298, 337
Spalding, Bishop (Episcopal Church, U.S.A.), 158
Spalding, Bishop (R.C.), 324
Spiritualities, 79
Spottiswoode, Archbishop of Glasgow, 352, 397
Standing Committee, Diocesan (U.S.A.), 159–161
Stanley, Dean of Westminster, 396
Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua, 51

Stauropegia, 313, 314
Steenoven, Archbishop of Utrecht, 336, 337
Stephen, St., 10, 12, 14
Stephen, Waldensian Bishop, 371
Stillingfleet, Bishop, 361, 362
Stockholm, 322
Strachan, Bishop of Toronto, 182–186, 188, 189, 195
Stray Bishops. *See* Wandering Bishops.
Streeter, B. H., 25 n., 27 n., 30, 32, 43
Strengnäs, 321
Stretton, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, 85
Stubbs, Bishop of Oxford, 371
Suffragan bishops, 84, 85, 93, 94, 100, 103, 121, 156, 157, 168, 205, 206
Superintendent-General (Prussia), 394, 395
Superintendent (Methodist), 359, 360, 364, 391
Sweden, 321–333, 393
Switzerland, 298, 337–339, 392, 400
Sydney, 253, 257, 259
Synod, Diocesan, 81, 100–102, 108, 112, 113, 118, 130, 132, 135, 140–145, 182–191, 193, 195, 196, 198, 202, 207, 208, 210, 221–223, 228–249, 253, 257, 259, 260, 263–265, 271, 274, 278–282, 284
Synod, Episcopal, 52–57, 95, 117, 130–133, 135, 174, 182–187, 189, 191–195, 197, 198, 204–206, 208, 210, 216–221, 223, 224, 231, 236, 237, 242, 244, 253, 257, 272, 273, 276–282, 284, 285, 316–319, 339, 376. *See also* Convocation.
Synod, General: (Australia), 257–259; (Canada) 174, 192–195, 198; (Ireland) 143–145; (New Zealand) 262–265
Synod, Petty, 316, 317, 319
Synod, Provincial (South Africa), 278–280
Synods, 47
Synods, Presbyterian, 394, 398, 400
Syria, 26, 27, 28 n., 33, 34, 37, 38, 53
Syrian Church, 316
Syrians, East, 59

Talbot, Bishop, 153
Tamil Lutheran Church, 331
Tammerfors, 331
Tasmania, 251, 253, 258
Temple, Frederick, Archbishop of Canterbury, 92
Temporalities, 79
Terry, E., 209
Tertullian, 50 n., 64, 65
Testament of our Lord, 50, 52, 57, 59–61, 62 n., 63, 64
Texas, 158
Thessalonians, Ep. i, 20
Thomas of Přelouč, 372
Timothy, St., 18, 23, 24, 31, 39, 40 n., 48, 349
Tinnevelly, 203, 205, 206
Titus, St., 24, 31, 39, 40 n., 48
Tobago, 225, 231
Toledo, 55
Torah, 6
Toronto, 174, 183, 187–189, 193
Tottie, Bishop of Kalmar, 331
Townsville, 258
Tozer, Bishop of Jamaica and Honduras, 242
Tozer, Bishop, U.M.C.A., 287
Tranquebar, 331
Translation, 139, 167
Travancore, 207
Treasurer, 76
Trefnant, Bishop of Hereford, 73
Trent, Council of, 292, 339
Trinchinopoly, 332
Trinidad, 225, 230, 239, 240
Truro, 88
Turkey, Turks, 315
Turner, Bishop of Calcutta, 269
Turner, Professor, 39, 52 n., 218
Tuttle, Presiding Bishop (U.S.A.), 153, 169
Tyrrell, Bishop of Worcester, 255, 256

Uniformity, Acts of, 104–107, 219
Unigenitus, Bull, 337
Unitas Fratrum, 370–373
Upsala, 321–324, 326, 327, 331, 332, 393, 394
Utrecht, 335–337, 339; Archbishop of, 339, 340; Declaration of, 338

Valerius, Bishop of Hippo, 71
Vancouver, 179
Varlet, Bishop of Babylon, 336, 337
Vasey, Wesleyan Minister, 365
Vatican Council, 337, 339, 340
Vesterås, 321, 322, 324
Vexiö, 321
Viborg, 331
Vicar Apostolic, 291
Vicar-Bishop, 277
Vicar-General, 75
Victoria (Australia), 251, 256, 258
Victoria (Vancouver), 180
Vienna, 371
Vincent of Lerins, St., 339
Virgin Islands, 225

Virginia, 152, 154
Visby, 331
Visitation, 80, 81, 101, 103, 118, 161, 162, 183, 184, 198, 296, 297, 300, 332
Vosmeer, Archbishop of Utrecht, 336

WAIAPU, 262
Wakeman, H. O., 97
Waldenses, 371, 372
Wales, 88, 114–128
Wandering Bishops, 309, 342
Washington, 166
Webb, A. B., Bishop, 288
Wellington, 262
Wesley, Charles, 365–367
Wesley, John, 359–369, 391–393
Wesleyanism, 277, 285, 359–369, 394, 401
West Indies, Archbishop of, 243, 244
West, John, 177
Westbury, Lord, 272
Westcott, Foss, Bishop, 203
Western Australia, 251, 256, 258
Westminster Assembly, 351
Whatcoat, Wesleyan Minster, 365
Whipple, Bishop of Minnesota, 153
White, Bishop of Pennsylvania, 148, 149, 151, 158, 164, 166
White, Bishop (U.S.A.), 368
Whitney, Professor J. P., 77
Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford, 75, 76, 98
Wilberforce, W., 201
Wilkinson, Bishop of Zululand, 286
William III, 345, 352, 396
Williams, Bernard, Bishop (Old Roman Catholic), 341
Williams, Bishop of Connecticut, 158, 169
Williams, C. D., Bishop, 158
Williams, Mott, Bishop, 323, 324, 328, 333
Willochra, 259
Wilmer, Bishop of Alabama, 158
Wilson, Bishop of Calcutta, 209, 210, 219, 269
Winchester, 94
Windward Islands, 230, 231
Winton, W. de, 122
Wirgman, A. T., 271
Wolsey, Cardinal, 83
Woods, Bishop of Peterborough (now Winchester), 324
Worcester, 83, 84
Wyclif, 84, 355

YORK, 87, 91, 94, 110, 128, 138
Yugo-Slavia, 313, 318, 319, 395
Yukon, 176, 180

ZINZENDORF, Count, 370
Zululand, 286

Printed in England at THE BALLANTYNE PRESS
SPOTTISWOODE, BALLANTYNE & CO. LTD.
Colchester, London & Eton

DATE DUE

UNITED THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BV670.J4 1930
Episcopacy, ancient and mo
3 0645 0002 6587 2